Daily Report

Soviet Union

FBIS-SOV-90-054
Tuesday
20 March 1990

Daily Report
Soviet Union

FBIS-SOV-90-054 *20 March 1990*

CONTENTS

ARMS CONTROL & DISARMAMENT

Chernyshev Cited on Need for Naval Arms Talks *[TASS]* 1
Soviet Military Inspectors End Work in Norway *[TASS]* 1

WORLDWIDE ISSUES

Gerasimov Views Soviet Stance on German Question *[TASS]* 2
Gerasimov Gives Briefing on World Issues, 19 Mar 3
Troop Movement in Lithuania *[TASS]* 3
U.S. Spy Satellite *[TASS]* 3
Lukanov, Gorbachev Meeting *[TASS]* 3
Normalization of Israeli Relations *[TASS]* 3
FRG Role in GDR Election *[AFP]* 4
FRG, GDR Politicians Comment on Elections *[TASS]* 4

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

United States & Canada

Analyst Criticizes New U.S. Defense Manual *[PRAVDA 19 Mar]* 5
Baker Begins African Tour; To Meet Shevardnadze *[TASS]* 5
U.S. Admiral Crowe Arrives in Moscow 17 Mar *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 18 Mar]* 6
Crowe Visits Kiev, Leaves for Odessa *[TASS]* 6
Paper Speculates on U.S. Spy Satellite Fate *[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 20 Mar]* 6
U.S. Election Commission Group Meets Lukyanov *[TASS]* 6
Bush Opposition to Loans for USSR Noted *[PRAVDA 19 Mar]* 7
U.S. Arms Experts in Missile Plant 'Incident' *[Moscow International]* 7
Moscow TV Airs Interview With U.S. Ambassador 7
Atlantic Institute To Hold Meeting in Budapest *[TASS]* 8

China

PRC's Yang Sends Greetings to Gorbachev *[Moscow International]* 9
Text of Message to Gorbachev *[PRAVDA 19 Mar]* 9
CPC Propaganda Chief, Others Arrive in Moscow *[TASS]* 9
PRC's Premier Praises Relations With USSR *[TASS]* 9

Northeast Asia

Kim Yong-sam Welcomes Gorbachev's 'New Thinking' *[Moscow International]* 9
Mongolian Defense Minister Views Perestroyka *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 17 Mar]* 9
Commentary Views Japanese Election Outcome *[Moscow International]* 11
Japan's Increasing Military Burdens Examined *[Moscow International]* 12

Southeast Asia & Pacific

Commentator Examines Solutions to Cambodian Issue *[Moscow International]* 13
Commentary Views Cambodian Peace Process *[Moscow International]* 13

Near East & South Asia

Pakistan, USSR To Continue POW Efforts *[Islamabad Radio]* 14
Commentary Views Request for Tanay's Extradition *[Moscow International]* 14
Afghan Shiites' Meeting in Tehran Detailed *[Radio Peace and Progress]* 14

Iranian Media Reaction to Soviet Congress Noted *[Radio Peace and Progress]* 15
Foreign Ministry Official Pays Visit to Aden *[TASS]* 15
Polyakov Meets 'Ali Salim al-Bid *[TASS]* 16
Claims of Fire at Libyan Plant Examined *[IZVESTIYA 16 Mar]* 16
'Vremya' Announcer Condemns Bazoft Execution *[Moscow TV]* 16

Sub-Saharan Africa

Shevardnadze Continues Tour of African Countries 17
Shevardnadze Cited on Peace in Angola *[AFP]* 17
Shevardnadze Meets Dos Santos *[TASS]* 17
Shevardnadze-Dos Santos Talks Held *[TASS]* 17
Shevardnadze Departs for Zambia *[TASS]* 18
Arrival in Zambia Reported *[TASS]* 18
South African Changes 'Irreversible' *[Moscow International]* 18
Shevardnadze, Zambia's Kaunda Meet *[TASS]* 18
Shevardnadze Leaves for Namibia *[TASS]* 19
Arrival in Namibia Reported *[TASS]* 19
Call for UN Troops To Stay in Namibia Noted *[PRAVDA 19 Mar]* 19
Fierce Fighting, Food Aid to Ethiopia Viewed *[Moscow International]* 20
Legislators Issue Communique on Mozambican Visit *[Moscow International]* 20
Somalia's Desire for Peace Talks Hailed *[Moscow International]* 21
Polisario Front Says Ready For New Truce *[Algiers Radio]* 21

East Europe

Bulgarian Premier Andrey Lukanov Visits Moscow 21
Pre-Visit Interview Reported *[RAVOCHAYA TRIBUNA 18 Mar]* 21
Gorbachev Receives Lukanov *[Moscow TV]* 22
Gorbachev-Lukanov Talks Detailed *[PRAVDA 20 Mar]* 23
Lukanov Comments on Talks *[TASS]* 24
Further on Lukanov Comments *[TASS]* 24
Ryzhkov Holds Talks With Lukanov *[TASS]* 24
Further on Ryzhkov-Lukanov Talks *[PRAVDA 20 Mar]* 25
Lukanov Leaves Moscow *[TASS]* 25
Figures for Soviet-Bulgarian Trade Cited *[PRAVDA 16 Mar]* 26
Falin Expresses Support for German Peace Treaty *[East Berlin ADN]* 26
TASS Observer Analyzes GDR Election Results 26
East, West German Leaders View Poll Results *[London BBC]* 27
Poland's Jaruzelski Welcomes Gorbachev Election *[PRAVDA 17 Mar]* 28
USSR-Polish Trade Turnover Protocol Reported *[TASS]* 29
Raw Materials Loom Large in Trade With Poland *[PRAVDA 16 Mar]* 29

West Europe

Col Gen Omelichev Pays Visit to Britain *[TASS]* 30
Bonn Figures Talk Off the Record on Unification *[PRAVDA 16 Mar]* 30

Latin America & Caribbean

Argentina's Menem Makes Statement on Gorbachev *[TASS]* 31
Future Political Direction of Cuba Pondered *[ARGUMENTY I FAKTY No 11]* 31

NATIONAL AFFAIRS

Supreme Soviet Session

Session To Discuss Issues on Security, Economy *[Moscow Radio]* 33
Supreme Soviet Session To Continue to Mid-May *[Moscow International]* 33
Moscow TV Carries Supreme Soviet Session 19 Mar 33
Lukyanov Chairs Session 33

Nishanov on Secession Law 34
Various Topics Mentioned 34
Media Coverage Discussed 36
Primakov Informs Supreme Soviet on Agenda *[TASS]* 37
Primakov Gives Speech 19 March *[Moscow TV]* 38
Lithuanian Deputy Reads Parliamentary Address *[TASS]* 40
Deputies Discuss Situation in Lithuania *[Moscow TV]* 40
Broadcasting of Supreme Soviet Discussed *[Moscow Radio]* 41
Text of Ownership Law Enabling Resolution *[PRAVDA 10 Mar]* 41

Congress of People's Deputies

PRAVDA Account of Gorbachev News Conference *[17 Mar]* 42
Transcript of Gorbachev Remarks on Lithuania *[IZVESTIYA 17 Mar]* 47

Political & Social

11 Mar CPSU Plenum Debate Speeches Outlined *[PRAVDA 17 Mar]* 48
Ligachev, Others Address Party Plenum *[PRAVDA 18 Mar]* 64
USSR Law on Ownership Published 10 Mar *[PRAVDA 10 Mar]* 72
PRAVDA Hails Creation of Presidency *[19 Mar]* 79
Nationalists Win Parliamentary Poll *[Paris AFP]* 80
Elections in Baltics Viewed; Siberian Turnout Low *[Moscow TV]* 81
Official Examines Cost of February Demonstrations *[MOSCOW NEWS No 10]* 81

Economic

Party Official Interviewed on Strike Situation *[RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA 8 Mar]* 82
Payment of Bribes by Cooperatives Discussed *[PRAVDA 16 Mar]* 84

Agricultural

Agricultural Developments for 1-7 March Noted *[Moscow Radio]* 86
Public Poll Indicates Majority Approve Land Law *[Moscow International]* 86
Late Weather, Crop Conditions Reported 86
Late-January, Early February *[SELSKAYA ZHIZN 4 Feb]* 86
Late-February Conditions *[SELSKAYA ZHIZN 6 Mar]* 87

Scientific

Cosmos-2061 Launched Into Orbit *[TASS]* 88

Military

Reforms Urged To Cure Army's Poor Morale *[AFP]* 88
Col Gen Interviewed on Principles of Armed Forces *[TASS]* 88
Accusations Against Internal Forces Rejected *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 17 Mar]* 88
Arkhipov Discusses Performance of Military Farms *[TASS]* 89
Naval Accidents Blamed on Unreliable Hardware *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 15 Mar]* 90
Mi-26 Helicopter Performance, Problems Reported *[Moscow TV]* 94

REGIONAL AFFAIRS

Baltic Republics

Vilnius Radio Carries 20 Mar Supreme Council 95
Coat of Arms Discussed 95
Marking of Borders Debated 95
Landsbergis Responds to Moscow Statements *[Vilnius International]* 96
Rival Vilnius Political Rallies Held *[RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA 20 Mar]* 97
More on Rallies *[SELSKAYA ZHIZN 20 Mar]* 97

Vilnius Radio Carries 19 Mar Supreme Council 98
Greetings Conveyed 98
Structure of Council Debated 98
Election Timing Debated 99
USSR Issues Statement on Lithuania *[TASS]* 99
Landsbergis 19 Mar Council Statement *[Vilnius Radio]* 100
Lithuanian Leadership Rejects Congress Decision *[Moscow TV]* 102
Frolov Comments on Lithuanian Secession Issue *[TASS]* 102
Lithuanian Citizens Group Appeals to Gorbachev *[TASS]* 103
International Communications Cut From Lithuania *[Vilnius Radio]* 103
More on Communications Blockade *[Vilnius International]* 104
Anticommunism in Lithuania Deplored by Paper *[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 20 Mar]* 104
Party Activities Suspended in Official Services *[RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA 4 Mar]* 106
Sajudis Official, Ligachev Questioned on Lithuania *[Prague RUDE PRAVO]* 106
Lithuania's Zukas Comments on Secession *[Moscow International]* 106
Council Issues Decree on Religious Buildings *[SOVETSKAYA LITVA 24 Feb]* 107
Toome Discusses Meeting With Party Officials *[Tallinn Radio]* 107
Gorbachev Addresses Estonian Party Meeting *[TASS]* 108
Estonian Supreme Soviet Election Results Reported *[Moscow Radio]* 108
Party Leaders Urge Estonia To Avoid Split *[AFP]* 108
Estonian Front Election Strategies Viewed *[SELSKAYA ZHIZN 12 Mar]* 109
Latvian Candidate Discusses Political Issues *[SOVETSKAYA LATVIYA 1 Mar]* 110
Latvian People's Front Official on Independence *[Stockholm Radio]* 112
Preliminary Results for Latvian Elections Reviewed *[TASS]* 112
Participation in Election Viewed *[Riga Radio]* 113
More on Latvian Elections *[Vilnius International]* 113
Second Round Viewed *[TASS]* 113

RSFSR

Reportage on RSFSR Run-off Elections 113
Voter Turnout 'Somewhat Lower' *[TASS]* 113
Preliminary Information *[Moscow Radio]* 114
Further Preliminary Results *[Moscow Radio]* 114
Vote-Counting Continues *[Moscow TV]* 114
24 Deputies Elected in Minsk *[Moscow Radio]* 114
Reformers Win in Moscow, Leningrad *[AFP]* 115
Volgograd Bureau, Secretaries 'Forced To Resign' *[Moscow Radio]* 115

Western Republics

Belorussian Run-off Election Results Reported *[TASS]* 115
More on Belorussian Elections *[Moscow Radio]* 115
Ivashko, Rukh, Greens Win in Ukraine Elections *[Moscow Radio]* 115
Ukraine Supreme Soviet Candidate Disqualified *[Kiev International]* 116
Kharkov Soviet Accuses Party Leaders of Abuse *[Moscow International]* 116
Ukrainian Peasant-Democratic Party Founded *[Kiev International]* 116

Central Asia

Instigators of Tajik 'Coup' Removed, Expelled *[Moscow Radio]* 116
Tajik Deputies Interviewed on Dushanbe Situation *[Moscow TV]* 117

Chernyshev Cited on Need for Naval Arms Talks

LD1903221590 Moscow TASS in English 1653 GMT 19 Mar 90

[By TASS military writer Vladimir Chernyshev]

[Text] Moscow March 19 TASS—A regular round of negotiations on confidence and security-building measures in Europe has opened in Vienna. It is being attended by representatives of 35 countries, signatories to the Helsinki Final Act.

Now that there is more certainty with regard to the temporary framework of an all-European summit meeting, it is necessary to accelerate the pace of the negotiations and constructive efforts should be taken by all the participants in order to fulfill the amassed potential of mutual understanding and find compromises on outstanding problems.

What is now the main problem at the negotiations? Things will not progress, if NATO representatives do not show due attention for specific initiatives of the USSR and other Warsaw Treaty countries, which propose that not only land troops but also air and naval forces be comprehensively covered by the confidence-building measures.

The progress attained in the process of disarmament in conventional forces on the continent makes more acute the need to lend a comprehensive character to stability, confidence and openness in Europe. Confidence is indivisible and cannot be a privilege of only one form of military activity, now that more powerful armaments are gradually emerging in seas and oceans. You don't have to be an expert on military strategy to understand that it is simpler to stage a sudden attack from the sea.

The North Atlantic alliance's approach to the problem has unfortunately been narrow for a long time. NATO disregarded the airforce and navy as a whole, making an exception only for their separate components—amphibian, aeromobile and air-landing forces, which are functionally linked with land troops.

Following the West's consent to include combat planes and helicopters into the agenda of the negotiations of 23 (sixteen NATO countries and seven Warsaw Treaty countries) on the reduction of conventional troops in Europe, there is now a possibility that confidence-building measures will also embrace aviation. But the navy is left aside, as before.

Such a stand cannot but give rise to concern. The United States and NATO have naval superiority over the USSR and the Warsaw Treaty. If Western naval might is retained at the current level (NATO refuses to have relevant negotiations), and confidence-building measures do not involve naval activities, the threat of war for the Warsaw Treaty Organisation will not lessen, but increase, following radical cuts in conventional weapons in Europe.

In Western capitals they should think over how to develop the Stockholm confidence-building measures towards greater openness and predictability of military activity not only on land but also in the air and the sea. Only then will it be possible to speak about real confidence and stability.

Soviet Military Inspectors End Work in Norway

LD1603221790 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1741 GMT 16 Mar 90

[Text] Moscow, 16 Mar (TASS)—It is reported officially here that the group of Soviet military inspectors today concluded their inspection of the stated area on the territory of Norway.

The inspection was conducted on the basis of the appropriate articles of the document of the Stockholm conference on confidence-building measures, security, and disarmament in Europe.

Gerasimov Views Soviet Stance on German Question

LD1903161990 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1503 GMT 19 Mar 90

["Urgent: USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs on Soviet Position Regarding the German Question"—TASS headline]

[Text] Moscow, 19 March. (TASS)—"We respect the will of the citizens of the GDR, a sovereign state allied to us, and, respecting this right to choice, proceed from the fact that in turn, the legitimate interests of the Soviet Union, European stability, and security and cooperation in the broad context of development of the pan-European process will be respected." Today Gennadiy Gerasimov, head of the USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs Information Administration, made this statement at a briefing, expressing the point of view of the Soviet Union on the results of the GDR Volkskammer election that took place yesterday.

In connection with this, the USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs spokesman stated the USSR position on the German question. First, he said, the Germans have the right to unity, but, nevertheless, they must take into account the rights and interests of others. On this account, there is a framework delineated by the quadripartite agreements and decisions. The idea of self-determination and the construction of German unity can be realized only in such a way that never again will a threat to peace emanate from German soil.

The German question should be tackled in such a way that positive peaceful tendencies are not destroyed, but, on the contrary, are strengthened, continued Gennadiy Gerasimov. Since the process of the rapprochement and unification of the two German states is indivisible from the pan-European process, inasmuch that a stage by stage and democratic approach is necessary, the path to unification lies in gradually forming mechanisms of cooperation between the West and East for the new Germany.

The Soviet diplomat emphasized that a united Germany should not join NATO, for this would lead to a break in the military-strategic balance in Europe—the basis of stability and security, mutual trust, and cooperation.

From the Soviet side's point of view, the diplomat said, the following path could be promising: the military-political status of a united Germany should fit into the new pan-European security structures, and the stages of its formation should be synchronized with stages of the formation of its structures.

In the words of the Soviet Foreign Ministry representative, the military potential of a united Germany must correspond to the principle of reasonable sufficiency, and the measures to demilitarize it must extend to both parts of Germany.

In the Soviet side's opinion, in many respects the realities in Europe force one to look at security matters in a new way, to overcome the inertia of bloc-based approaches, and to think about the continent's security on the basis of combined efforts and concepts. The Soviet Union sees the way towards this as being in a gradual transformation of the military-political alliances and the establishment of a political dialogue and contact between them. The all-European summit meeting planned for the end of the year, at which German affairs will take their place on the agenda, is intended to play an important role in this process.

The issue of the unconditional consolidation of the post-war German borders in an international legal framework [rezhim] is critical, the diplomat noted. Recognition of borders should, to an equal degree, be extended to the Oder-Neisse border as well and to the fact of the entry of East Prussia into Poland and the Soviet Union.

The issue of the conclusion of a peace treaty with Germany is very important, pointed out the USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs spokesman. The obligation of concluding such a treaty is registered in the FRG agreements with the three Western powers as well as in GDR treaties with the USSR. These treaty obligations should be fulfilled before the final reunification, and all interested states should recognize this internationally.

Right up to this point, the rights and responsibility of the four powers are preserved. Their core is the formula registered in the Potsdam agreement on the prerogatives of the four powers "now and in the future" to adopt measures to ensure that "Germany never again threatens her neighbors or the preservation of peace in the whole world."

Special attention, in the diplomat's words, is merited by the danger of the renaissance of fascism on German soil. A united Germany should assume the obligation to carry out unconditionally the statutes of the Potsdam agreement in this respect, he said.

The German issue is not only being discussed within the framework of the Warsaw Pact, continued Gennadiy Gerasimov. A special negotiation mechanism on external aspects of the construction of German unity—the negotiations of the "Six" have been established. The first session of the "Six" at the level of experts would take place alternately in the FRG and GDR, it has been determined. The next meeting will take place in Berlin after the formation of the new GDR Government. It is important, the diplomat noted, that issues in the "Six" should be resolved by consensus.

Gennadiy Gerasimov positively assessed the fact that the "Six" had taken account of Poland's wish to take part in the discussion of issues touching on its interests. Realization is also emerging that accords reached within the framework of the mechanism of the "Six" should be consolidated by the leaders of the 35 participant-states of the Helsinki process, he stressed.

Gerasimov Gives Briefing on World Issues, 19 Mar

Troop Movement in Lithuania

LD1903163890 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1520 GMT 19 Mar 90

[Text] Moscow, 19 March (TASS)—"The realization of a people's right to self-determination cannot be implemented by one hasty decision," Gennadiy Gerasimov, chief of the Information Administration of the USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs, stated at a briefing, in reply to a question about the events currently taking place in Lithuania.

In the Soviet diplomat's words, such haste must not take place, because the profound interests not only of the Lithuanian people but also of other peoples in the country are affected here, while the Lithuanian people's destiny, economy, and culture have become very closely intertwined with the life of the USSR's other peoples and form a single interconnected organism. "We consider," stressed Gennadiy Gerasimov, "that the Lithuanian people and the USSR have an interest in finding such solutions that would preserve, above all, our union, ensuring that there are differentiated federative ties based on a new treaty of union [soyuznyy dogovor]."

"If the people residing in Lithuania ultimately decide to withdraw from the Soviet Union, on the basis of a referendum," said the USSR Foreign Ministry representative, "this must naturally be a process that includes the consideration of a whole complex of issues, as a result of which the interests of both Lithuania and the Soviet Union will be implemented." There are various interests here—to be specific, economic and legal ones.

Gennadiy Gerasimov drew attention to the fact that "the outside world is holding back from recognizing Lithuania, in spite of the requests issuing from Vilnius." The basic reason for this, he noted, lies in the fact that the world values perestroyka, and that the governments of other countries would not like to create additional hindrances for the first president of the USSR, who has only just entered office. In addition, stressed the diplomat, no one in the world likes to encourage separatists. From a legal point of view, a hasty recognition would represent "intervention and interference in the domestic affairs of another country," and would be a violation of the foundations of international law.

In conclusion, the representative of the USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs refuted rumors about a major troop movement, which is supposedly taking place in Lithuania. According to information obtained at the USSR Ministry of Defense, "no major exercises are taking place on the territory of Lithuania, and the troops are operating in accordance with the current plans for combat training."

U.S. Spy Satellite

LD1903141790 Moscow TASS in English 1406 GMT 19 Mar 90

[Text] Moscow March 19 TASS—"The Soviet public is disturbed by reports that a U.S. intelligence satellite, put into orbit on March 1, has gone out of control and its fragments may drop on Soviet territory," Soviet Foreign Ministry spokesman Gennadiy Gerasimov told a briefing here today.

"In view of the possible negative consequences," he noted, "the Soviet Foreign Ministry has asked the U.S. State Department for information about the satellite's flight, including forecasts of possible places where fragments may be expected to drop."

Lukanov, Gorbachev Meeting

LD1903131190 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1240 GMT 19 Mar 90

[Text] Moscow, 13 Mar (TASS)—There will be a meeting in Moscow this afternoon between Mikhail Gorbachev, president of the USSR, and Andrei Lukanov, chairman of the Council of Ministers of the People's Republic of Bulgaria, who has come here on a working visit at the invitation of the Soviet leadership. This has just been announced at a briefing by Gennadiy Gerasimov, head of the Information Directorate of the USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs.

The spokesman stated that Andrei Lukanov has already held talks in Moscow with Nikolay Ryzhkov, chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers. The sides exchanged views on the political and socioeconomic situation and the radical reform processes in both countries. They also examined issues connected with cooperation in the new circumstances and discussed international issues, Gennadiy Gerasimov noted.

Normalization of Israeli Relations

LD1903142690 Moscow TASS in English 1410 GMT 19 Mar 90

[Text] Moscow March 19 TASS—"The Soviet Union, which, like everybody else, is interested in a durable peace between Arabs and Israel, wants to see developments lead to a comprehensive settlement of the Middle East conflict and solution of the Palestinian problem," Soviet Foreign Ministry spokesman Gennadiy Gerasimov said at a briefing here today.

"Favourable prerequisites will thereby appear to normalise Soviet-Isreali relations," he added.

Gerasimov commented on the Israeli parliament's vote of non- confidence in the Yitzhaq Shamir cabinet. "The crisis has been caused by the governing coalition's acute differences over an Israeli-Palestinian dialogue which would usher in a peace process," he said.

FRG Role in GDR Election

AU1903142790 Paris AFP in English 1401 GMT 19 Mar 90

[Text] Moscow, March 19 (AFP)—Soviet spokesman Gennadiy Gerasimov, in Moscow's first official comment on the East German conservatives' election victory, on Monday criticized West German politicians for campaigning in East Germany.

The Foreign Ministry spokesman told a press conference here that it was "abnormal for citizens of another country to have taken part in the election campaign" in East Germany.

West German Chancellor Helmut Kohl took a high profile in the campaign, and his Christian Democratic Party bankrolled the East German Christian Democrats, who stormed to a landslide victory Sunday.

But Mr. Gerasimov stressed that Moscow "respects the opinion of the German people," adding that "we expect our legitimate interests and those of other European countries to be respected."

FRG, GDR Politicians Comment on Elections

LD1903131690 Moscow TASS in English 1001 GMT 19 Mar 90

[Text] Berlin March 19 TASS—The preliminary results of the parliamentary elections in the German Democratic Republic (GDR) have prompted various comments from the GDR's political figures and from leading politicians of the Federal Republic of Germany (FRG) visiting here.

Egon Bahr, a prominent figure among West German Social Democrats, described the previously predicted electoral victory of the "Alliance for Germany" as the result of unusually lavish material promises.

Bahr said he had never witnessed such an election struggle in the FRG. As compared with other parties, the Social Democratic Party of Germany (GDR) honestly waged the struggle. He believes that the GDR needs a strong broad-based government.

Lothar de Maiziere, chairman of the Christian Democratic Union (GDR), also called for the establishment of a "broad government coalition." In addition to the "alliance for Germany" parties, it should include other groups as well. Talks should be also held with the SPD (GDR).

In a television interview, De Maiziere said he would support the candidacy of Elmar Pieroth from the West Berlin CDU for minister of the economy. The establishment of an economic, monetary and social union between the two German states will be on the agenda soon. Solving the German unity question is impossible without the participation of neighbouring countries, the CDU chairman emphasised.

Proceeding from the first forecasts about election results, Hans Modrow, honarary chairman of the Party of Democratic Socialism (PDS), does not rule out the possibility of the PDS's coalition with the Democratic Peasant Party of Germany and the Greens Party of the GDR.

Ibrahim Boehme, chairman of the SPD (GDR), expressed dissatisfaction with election results. He said the people declared for a quick move towards reunification. On Monday the SPD board is expected to discuss participation in a broad coalition.

United States & Canada

Analyst Criticizes New U.S. Defense Manual

LD1903124290 Moscow TASS in English 1115 GMT 19 Mar 90

[Text] Moscow March 19 TASS—A new U.S. Armed Forces' manual applicable to regional conflicts, now being elaborated by the U.S. Joint Chiefs of Staff, is a manifestation of "ordinary imperial mentality that everything goes in the use of American combat potential abroad," a PRAVDA analyst writes in the newspaper today.

"According to the DEFENCE NEWS, a knowledgeable source on Army affairs, the 'doctrine of joint operations in low-intensity warfare' allows the use of American troops in combat operations against insurgency forces on the territories of Third-World countries only as 'a last resort', i.e. as something enforced when there is no other way out," PRAVDA writes.

"The emphasis on restraint should undoubtedly be only welcomed. Especially as the idea comes from the military. This is precisely what the Third World, lacerated by conflicts, is lacking.

"And still, some doubt creeps into one's mind when one familiarises oneself with the 'doctrine'. Why should the armed forces of one country consider it admissible in general to determine under what conditions they should attack other countries?

"Whether the situation calls for 'a last resort' or not is, in the final analysis, a detail. The principle remains the same, namely, that everything goes—the usual imperial all- permissiveness in the use of American combat potential abroad.

"Where are criteria of the need for the 'last resort' and who will be guided by them? It appears that a breakthrough to new thinking, which presupposes a taboo on interventions, is so far slow in coming in U.S. military and political spheres.

"The ideas of the manual," Tyurkin points out, "are based on the 'good government' and 'bad insurgents' categories, which is usual for an official document.

"But Nicaragua, Angola and Afghanistan could testify that Washington is not averse to interfering in the developing countries according to a different principle—a 'bad government' and 'good insurgents', i.e. intervention of a different kind—subversive. Although secret services, not the army, are the main instrument in that case, does this change anything in essence? A war is still a war whatever the wrapping.

"It seems that the generals' manual has become obsolescent in the very process of elaboration, for the simple reason that it is lacking a basic novelty.

"The time of adventuristic actions from the position of strength is receding into the past. At any rate this is a dominant trend. The experience, including positive, indicates that conflicts can be resolved only by political means. Without the use of force from outside even 'in the last resort'".

Baker Begins African Tour; To Meet Shevardnadze

LD1903101190 Moscow TASS in English 0948 GMT 19 Mar 90

[Text] Washington March 19 TASS—United States Secretary of State James Baker began his five-day African tour late on Sunday.

Baker will take part in independence ceremonies in Namibia on March 21 and 22 and will visit South Africa and Zaire. It will be the first visit by a U.S. secretary of state to Africa in seven years.

In Windhoek, Baker will meet Soviet Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze. The two ministers are expected to discuss ways to expedite a peace settlement in Angola, German unity and bilateral relations.

Announcing Baker's tour, a high-ranking State Department spokesman said it is designed to promote peace talks between Angola and the UNITA [National Union for Total Independence of Angola] rebels.

The United States and the Soviet Union agree that political settlement alone is possible in Angola and that a military solution is impossible.

However, the spokesman declined to reveal if Baker will bring concrete proposals to the meeting.

In Windhoek, Baker is also expected to meet United Nations Secretary-General Javier Perez de Cuellar, Angolan President Eduardo dos Santos, Egyptian President Hosni Mubarak, Indian Prime Minister Vishwanath Pratap Singh, West German Foreign Minister Hans Dietrich Genscher, and black nationalist leader Nelson Mandela.

From Windhoek, Baker will head for Capetown, where he will meet President F. de Klerk of South Africa, other South African leaders and representatives of the black majority.

Baker is expected to urge De Klerk to lift the state of emergency and release all political prisoners in South Africa.

The secretary will end his African tour with a visit to Zaire's capital Kinshasa, where he will talk with President Mobutu Sese Seko.

U.S. Admiral Crowe Arrives in Moscow 17 Mar

PM2003114790 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 18 Mar 90 First Edition p 4

[Report by Colonel V. Markushin: "Admiral W. Crowe in Moscow"]

[Text] Admiral W. Crowe arrived in the Soviet Union 17 March at the invitation of the Supreme Soviet Committee for Defense and State Security Questions.

During the American visitor's stay in our country, he will address members of the Supreme Soviet Committee for Defense and State Security Questions and the Committee for International Affairs; meet with Army General M.A. Moiseyev, chief of the USSR Armed Forces General Staff, and Marshal of the Soviet Union S.F. Akhromeyev; talk to men who participated in combat action in Afghanistan; and take short trips to Kiev, Odessa, and Novosibirsk.

The admiral himself, speaking about the aims of his visit in a conversation with a KRASNAYA ZVEZDA correspondent, stressed that he wanted to strengthen his friendship with Marshal S.F. Akhromeyev, get to know the country better, and breathe the Siberian air. W. Crowe expressed a high opinion of the role of Soviet-U.S. contacts on the military level and the hope that they would be deepened. Asked what he thought about the possibility of Washington's relaxing its stance on the question of talks on naval weapons, Admiral W. Crowe's response was that he believes it is still too early to talk about this. I simply do not know what to say about this matter at the moment, he said.

Crowe Visits Kiev, Leaves for Odessa

LD1903221290 Moscow TASS in English 1819 GMT 19 Mar 90

[Text] Kiev March 19 TASS—American Admiral Willian Crowe, now in the USSR at the invitation of the USSR Supreme Soviet's Defence and State Security Committee visited Kiev for two days.

He was received at the Ukrainian Supreme Soviet Presidium today. Presidium President Valentina Shevchenko told him about perestroyka in the republic.

Crowe favours broader Soviet-American peace dialogue.

Soviet Marshal Sergey Akhromeyev, secretary of the Ukrainian Supreme Soviet Presidium Nikolay Khomenko and Commander of the Troops of the Red Banner Kiev Military District Colonel-General Boris Gromov attended the meeting.

The admiral made a report to the faculty of the land forces' anti-aircraft defence academy named after Soviet Marshal Aleksandr Vasilevskiy.

He answered questions on American-Soviet relations, including in the sphere of disarmament.

Crowe visited the Eternal Glory park and laid a wreath to the Unknown Soldier's Tomb. The guest observed a minute of silence in memory of the Soviet servicemen who gave their lives for the motherland's freedom and mankind's deliverance from Hitlerite fascism. The Ukraine alone lost over five million people during the Second World War.

Crowe left for Odessa earlier today.

Paper Speculates on U.S. Spy Satellite Fate

PM2003101090 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 20 Mar 90 p 1

[V. Ostrovskiy report: "What the Pentagon Kept Quiet About"]

[Text] Late last Friday evening, a press conference was hurriedly called in the Pentagon on the fate of an American spy satellite that had been secretly sent into space.

But this time the Pentagon's secret "informer" failed to reach the target orbit in the initial period of independent flight. A number of technical problems arose, and could not be resolved. Presumably the masters of the spy satellite decided on its destruction, because on 7 March Soviet systems for monitoring the USSR's space pinpointed four fragments in a circular orbit around the Earth. Our newspaper reported this on 18 March. It was stated at the Washington press conference that parts of the satellite could fall anywhere on Earth between 62 degrees north and south, including USSR territory. Not, to be frank, very pleasant news. True, the "spy's" masters claim that the fragments will burn up and so no one is in danger.

However, the precise area where these sections will fall can only be determined a few hours before their entry into the dense strata of the atmosphere. Pentagon specialists knew this, but kept quiet about it, and now they are trying to reassure the international public... Competent Soviet sources told KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA that one fragment will enter the dense strata of the atmosphere at 1905 (Moscow time) on 19 March 500 km north of Petropavlovsk-na-Kamchatke. Whether it will burn up or not remains to be seen.

It only remains to wonder: Why did the Pentagon not announce in good time the parameters of the orbit of the space spy and its separated sections (in accordance with international rules) two weeks earlier?

U.S. Election Commission Group Meets Lukyanov

LD2003140290 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1143 GMT 20 Mar 90

[Text] Moscow, 20 Mar (TASS)—Contacts between the U.S. Federal Election Commission and the Central Election Commission for electing USSR People's Deputies, which for the first time exchanged delegations last year, have become a part of the Soviet-American dialogue and

contribute significantly to studying experience in developing the statehood of both countries.

This was noted at today's meeting between Anatoliy Lukyanov, chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet, and a delegation of the U.S. Federal Election Commission, led by its chairperson Lee-Ann Elliott [name as received]. The visitors are staying in the Soviet Union at the invitaiton of the Central Election Commission for electing USSR people's deputies.

During a thorough and frank exchange of views, which passed in an atmosphere of mutual understanding and amicability, Anatoliy Lukyanov familiarized members of the U.S. delegation with progress in implementing the reform of the political system in the Soviet Union.

Members of the delegation expressed their gratitude for the opportunity provided to them to broaden their knowledge of the system of elections in the USSR.

Bush Opposition to Loans for USSR Noted

PM2003113990 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 19 Mar 90 Second Edition p 1

[TASS report under the "Abroad" rubric: "White House Opposes Loans to the USSR. Interview with G. Bush"]

[Text] Washington, 18 Mar—U.S. President George Bush has opposed financial loans to the Soviet Union at present.

"I do not agree with the idea that we must grant the Soviet Union loans or give it money," he said in an interview with National Public Radio. "I have had differences of opinion on this question with the leader of the majority in the House of Representatives, who proposed granting the Soviet Union monetary aid now. I do not think that this is in America's interests, and I do not think that it is needed to stimulate reforms, perestroyka, and glasnost in the Soviet Union." The head of the White House stressed that the USSR has not, moreover, made any such requests.

In response to the question of whether the U.S. Administration's position is to prevent the USSR from obtaining credits from the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development for Eastern Europe, Bush replied: "No, but I believe that the Soviet Union must only obtain loans that do not exceed its paid-up share capital. This bank was established to aid small East European countries that are moving along the path of democracy. The Soviet Union still has a long way to go before it can be given secured loans."

The head of the administration reiterated his previously avowed stance according to which the United States can help the USSR most effectively by offering it technical assistance. "I welcome Gorbachev's attempts to restructure his economy, he said. "The Soviet Union's first steps must be to implement reform. Our first steps must constitute an attempt to help it implement those reforms."

U.S. Arms Experts in Missile Plant 'Incident'

LD1603225990 Moscow World Service in English 1810 GMT 16 Mar 90

[Text] Recent media reports in the United States have called into question the Soviet Union's observance of the treaty on medium and shorter-range missiles. Commentary is by our reporter on defense matters, Vadim Solovyev:

These reports follow a recent incident at the missile manufacturing plant in the city of Votknisk, in which a team of United States experts monitoring the production of medium-range missiles there decided to use verification equipment outside the INF treaty. The plant management stepped in quickly to ban it.

Although treaties are signed to honor them to the letter, afterwards the American experts nonetheless came at loggerheads with plant officials who went on with the production plan.

A fact-finding commission was immediately set up and sent down to Votkinsk, owing to efforts by the American Secretary of State Mr. Baker and his Soviet counterpart Mr Shevardnadze. The Soviet Foreign Ministry says the commission is now on its way back to Moscow after ending work in Votkisnk.

The Americans are said to have accepted the Soviet grievance and the incident is now over. However, details will be made known later after the commission submitted its report.

Given the delicacy of the issue more facts were needed on the substance of the incident before reporting it to the public at large. However, the LOS ANGELES TIMES, followed by the Voice of America, hastened to assure the public that the Soviet actions ran counter to the INF treaty. But the facts point to the reverse being true. The misinformation could have been attributed to a chase after sensational news. This seems to be a different case, coming as it does in the runup to the superpower summit in June. And the pertinent question is this: Aren't there some in the United States who are unwilling to cover the whole path of disarmament?

Moscow TV Airs Interview With U.S. Ambassador

LD1703115190

[Editorial report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 1920 GMT on 16 March broadcasts a 65-minute Estonian television feature on Jack Matlock, U.S. ambassador in Moscow. Throughout the program the ambassador is shown being interviewed in a comfortable interior setting in the U.S. Embassy. His answers

throughout are in fluent Russian. The program's end titles note that the interview was given on 17 November 1989.

In reply to the correspondent's questions Matlock says inter alia: He has a very full work load, but is happy with the work especially in the present period in Soviet-U.S. relations; he had always wanted to be the United State's representative in Moscow; relations between the USSR and the United States are extremely important for the whole world; the tendency in Soviet-U.S. relations is a very positive one now; the sides have now put the period of confrontation behind them; there are more and more elements of cooperation in their relations.

Matlock says that the United States is still concerned over the armed struggle in Central America and the fact that the delivery of arms to Nicaragua not by the Soviet Union but by other countries is continuing. In the Near East the United States would like to see some progress toward a peaceful settlement. The Soviet and U.S. positions on the Near East are now not very far apart, he says. The United States would like to see a cessation of military actions in Afghaistan. The Vienna talks on conventional armaments in Europe are proceeding fairly well. Agreement is still required on a fifty per cent reduction in strategic arms.

He goes on to say that the work of the U.S. Embassy is involved in the main with giving U.S. leaders a realistic grasp of what is happening in the Soviet Union and also with clarifying U.S. policy to the Soviet Union and explaining the American way of life.

Matlock said that this is his fourth spell in Moscow and he feels more or less at home there. He goes on to talk about his wife, the origins of his interest in Russian literature and culture, his typical working day, and his friendship with the Soviet writer Vasily Aksenov.

Matlock says he has many Soviet contacts and friends in the fields of literature, theater, diplomacy, business, the economy, science and the military. He has now addressed Soviet military academies on four occasions.

Most of the ancillary staff at the U.S. Embassy are now Americans, he notes. This stems directly from 1986 dispute involving the expulsion of diplomats. But Matlock thinks the present situation is better as it offers an opportunity for Americans to gain experience of Soviet life. Talks are still underway concerning the new U.S. Embassy building. Congress has to be consulted among others. He thinks that probably a new building will have to be erected.

Matlock goes on to note that the U.S. Embassy has contacts with most Soviet ministries now. He welcomes the Soviet Union's decision to allow more people to emigrate.

Atlantic Institute To Hold Meeting in Budapest

LD1803133390 Moscow TASS in English 0856 GMT 18 Mar 90

[Text] Washington March 18 TASS—"The changing Europe" was the subject which was discussed here for three days by participants in a round-table conference organised by the Atlantic Institute, an American public organisation.

U.S. Administration officials, leading experts in the field of East-West relations, and representatives of the country's business circles exchanged views on changes taking place in the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe.

Conference organisers believe that such a widely representative forum, during which various and at times contradictory points of view were expressed, will help the Americans to gain a better understanding of the essence of the events and will prompt the country's business community to take bolder steps towards establishing cooperation with the Soviet Union and East European countries.

On the one hand, speakers emphasised the interest of U.S. business in exploring new economic markets which, in the event of delay and indecision, may turn out to be occupied by West European, Japanese and South Korean companies that show increasing activity.

However, representatives from such big corporations as the American International Group, the Price Waterhouse, Honeywell and some other ones that have a wide experience in the transaction of affairs in the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe quite often voiced critical assessments of prospects for such cooperation.

This concerned in particular possibilities for the establishment of joint ventures, the development of which is still obstructed by economic incompetence, bureaucratic red tape and the lack of legal guarantees for American capital investments.

At the same time speakers at the forum pointed out that an improvement of climate in trade and economic relations, with the Soviet Union in particular, would in many respects be promoted by Washington's repeals of discriminatory legislation that does not allow Soviet commodities to be treated according to the most-favoured-nation status on the American market.

A Washington-Moscow televison link-up was arranged on the final day fo the round-table conference. A number of prominent journalists of the two countries dwelt in detail on the role of the press in the coverage of the developments in Europe and on its contribution to the strengthening of mutual understanding and cooperation between East and West.

Declaring the conference closed, its chairman David Rothkopf pointed out the indisputable success of round-table discussions, which is an illustration of an immense interest in the United States in changes in the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe.

In this connection the Atlantic Institute decided to hold a special conference on the subject "perestroika and cooperation" in Budapest on June 10-13, this year.

China

PRC's Yang Sends Greetings to Gorbachev

LD1803163890 Moscow World Service in English 1200 GMT 18 Mar 90

[Text] Chinese leader Yang Shangkun has spoken in favour of good-neighborly and friendly relations with the Soviet Union, relations that would meet the basic interests of the two countries, and serve peace and would contribute to greater stability in Asia and all over the world. This is said in a message of greetings sent to Mikhail Gorbachev following his inauguration as president of the USSR. The telegram was published in Beijing today.

Text of Message to Gorbachev

PM2003092990 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 19 Mar 90 Second Edition p 4

[PRC president's undated message to M.S. Gorbachev under general headline: "Cables of Congratulations"]

[Text] To USSR President Comrade M.S. Gorbachev

I congratulate you on your election to the post of president of the USSR.

China and the Soviet Union are neighboring socialist states. The development of good-neighborly and friendly relations between the two countries on the basis of the five principles of peaceful coexistence accords with the fundamental interests of the two countries' peoples and also promotes peace and stability in Asia and throughout the world.

I hope that both sides will continue to develop relations between the two countries guided by the accords secured last May during the Sino-Soviet summit and the spirit of the joint Sino-Soviet communique.

[Signed] Yang Shangkun, president of the PRC

CPC Propaganda Chief, Others Arrive in Moscow

LD1903162890 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1458 GMT 19 Mar 90

[Text] Moscow, 19 Mar (TASS)—A delegation from the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China led by Wang Renzhi, director of the Propaganda Department of the CPC Central Committee, arrived in Moscow today.

PRC's Premier Praises Relations With USSR

LD2003102290 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0345 GMT 20 Mar 90

[Text] [No dateline as received] The development of neighborly Chinese-Soviet relations on the basis of the five principles of peaceful cooperation corresponds to the interests of the peoples of the two countries and fosters the cause of peace in Asia and worldwide. This was stated by Li Peng, premier of the PRC State Council, in his report to the China National People's Congress session.

Following the normalization of relations between the PRC and the USSR in May of last year, the sides have expanded their contacts in all spheres on the basis of the principles of development of relations between them, agreed during the summit meeting, and in accordance with agreements which have been concluded. Talks are continuing on the border issue, and there have been advances in the talks of diplomatic and military expert groups, the head of the Chinese Government said.

Northeast Asia

Kim Yong-sam Welcomes Gorbachev's 'New Thinking'

SK2003021790 Moscow International Service in Korean 1100 GMT 17 Mar 90

[From the "Asian News" program under the "Focus on Asia" program]

[Text] Mr Kim Yong-sam, co-leader of the Democratic Liberal Party, ruling party of the ROK, welcomed the "new thinking" policy implemented by Mikhail Gorbachev, president of the Soviet Union. He declared that this policy has brought forth positive changes in world [word indistinct], adding that new qualitative changes are taking place in international relations from military and political confrontation to dialogue and cooperation. He noted that it is important that [word indistinct] detente and dialogue ought to include the Asian-Pacific region, where confrontation and military tension still (?prevail). [Words indistinct].

Mongolian Defense Minister Views Perestroyka

PM1903103190 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 17 Mar 90 First Edition p 5

[Interview with Mongolian Defense Minister Lieutenant General Luvsangombyn Molomjamts by TASS correspondent K. Boldokhonov; place and date of interview not specified; first paragraph is KRASNAYA ZVEZDA introduction: "Mongolia: The Army and Perestroyka"]

[Text] The 69th anniversary of the Mongolian People's Army [MPA] falls 18 March. On the eve of the important date K. Boldokhonov, TASS correspondent in Ulaanbaatar, interviewed Mongolian Defense Minister Lieutenant General Luvsangombyn Molomjamts.

[Boldokhonov] Perestroyka is becoming a more and more active process in Mongolian society. Can you tell us, please, how it is proceeding in the MPA. How do you see the army's role in present-day conditions?

[Molomjamts] The basic content of the renewal of the MPA is the improvement of management, the strengthening of the principle of one-man command in conditions of democracy, the renewal and amendment of military statutes, and the consistent introduction of scientific and technical progress. Ultimately all this is geared to ensuring a qualitatively new standard of army.

Recently, in the paper ULAAN OD, we published the prospectus for army perestroyka. The Mongolian People's Revolutionary Party and the government prefer political methods of safeguarding national security. Unfortunately, it is generally acknowledged that the proper conditions have not yet taken shape anywhere for the total transition to these methods. The MPA has one constant duty—to protect the homeland's independence and the people's safety. But it is no easy task for our country, with its large area and small population, a country that does not produce arms, to fully meet the demands of a defensive doctrine.

The important thing is that MPA personnel correctly understand the content and aims of perestroyka and support it. However, the old thinking, the old-fashioned style, the tendency to wait and see and be overcautious and so on are still present and are inhibiting the process. At the same time, life shows that we cannot act without considering the special features of the army, the number and size of the tasks facing it, and its actual potential. Attempts to accelerate the process of transformations too much do not bring the proper benefit.

I will say that conditions have now been created in the army for democracy and glasnost to unfold, and everyone can express his own ideas. We are not only learning to listen patiently to criticism but, most important of all, we are making a more vigorous effort to eliminate shortcomings. The rights and autonomy of formation and unit commanders are being broadened.

[Boldokhonov] Mongolia has started to reduce its armed forces. How is this process being implemented? Experience shows that reducing forces is difficult. What steps have been taken to provide accommodation and work for those who are discharged and their families?

[Molomjamts] In fact, it has been decided to reduce armed forces personnel by 13,000 in 1989-1990, and for our army that is a lot. In 1990 defense expenditure will be cut by 106 million tugriks.

The Council of Ministers has adopted a resolution providing for assistance for those who are discharged after 5-25 years of military service. They are given a single gratis allowance of 200 tugriks for each year of military service, and each member of the family who is unfit for work gets 100 tugriks. If a discharged officer or soldier with extended service of 10 years or more, has had a state yurt, he keeps it free of charge, and if he has served fewer than 10 years the yurt is sold to him at a discount. The army has organized transport for discharged officers to their home aimak, city, or somon [administrative unit].

The Council of Ministers has made it incumbent on ministries, departments, the executive administrations of aimaks and cities, and state and cooperative organizations to give discharged officers and soldiers with extended service every assistance in finding accommodation in new areas. But things are not running smoothly everywhere, as is shown by the complaints we are receiving.

The Defense Ministry has provided apartments for a small group of people who have many years of conscientious service in the army behind them. They should have been provided with apartments while still serving, of course. But, alas, we are not yet in a position to do this. A number of provisions have been envisaged or introduced on transferring discharged servicemen to civilian posts in the army and on a system of pensions and other benefits.

[Boldokhonov] The MPA is acknowledged as a provider of cadres for the national economy. What is its national economic function today?

[Molomjamts] In the past four years alone troops have carried out construction and installation work worth more than 9 million tugriks. They have commissioned 730 industrial, agricultural, and sociocultural facilities and installations. These include elevators at flour mills in Ulaanbaatar and Bulgan, the Ulaanbaatar consumer services combine, a fulling combine, a nonwoven materials enterprise, the first phase of a sewn goods combine, and many other facilities. In 1990 they will be carrying out construction and installation work worth 210 million tugriks.

[Boldokhonov] The public and the parents of young soldiers—judging by items in the Mongolian press—are continuing to voice concern in connection with bullying in the MPA. What is the cause of this anomaly, in your view? What steps are being taken to eliminate this vice?

[Molomjamts] First of all it should be said that our army's personnel comprise mainly conscientious, disciplined young troops. But in recent years such phenomena as bullying, which are untypical of our army, have been occurring among conscripts. We are fighting hard against this. But we have not yet managed to eliminate it. It is a serious matter. We are concerned about it.

There are various reasons for the bullying. In any case, the question must be studied in greater depth: Does a person "go bad" in the army or before being drafted? But we put this vice down mainly to our own deficiencies.

Our officers are deficient in skills and methods of leadership and education, including personal example. Selection of junior commanders is also of poor quality.

Forms and methods of agitation and propaganda and cultural and educational work are obsolete.

These shortcomings cannot be eliminated merely by strict orders, punishments, or demands from on high—in other words, merely by coercion. Therefore, in the struggle against this disgraceful phenomenon we are paying a great deal of attention to enhancing the role of squads, companies, and platoons, that is, the personnel of the primary military subunits.

Moreover, we are helping to maintain a constant link between troops and parents, relatives, friends, and the collectives where they worked or studied before being drafted. We are receiving help from them not only in eliminating violations and shortcomings but also in consolidating successes.

[Boldokhonov] There have been talks in Ulaanbaatar on the timeframe amd procedure for the complete withdrawal of the Soviet forces temporarily in Mongolia at the government's request. The Soviet forces are leaving. What is the political assessment of their presence and of their withdrawal?

[Molomjamts] On the basis of an agreement between the two countries' governments, 75 percent of the Soviet forces will be withdrawn fron Mongolia in 1989-1990. The complete withdrawal of the remaining 25 percent was agreed on recently. It was decided that the main combat personnel would return home in 1991. Since it is impossible over a short period to remove the stocks of materiel established by Soviet military units during their stay in Mongolia (particularly when you consider the problem of railroad capacity), this work will continue until the fourth quarter of 1992. In that period the small number of units and subunits remaining here to guard and remove the materiel will be fully withdrawn.

The withdrawal of Soviet forces from Mongolia is our two countries' real contribution to strengthening peace, security, and trust in the Asia-Pacific region and in the world as a whole. It is a consequence of the new political thinking.

The exploits performed by the Soviet people and their armed forces in the name of our country's freedom and independence will never fade. They will live forever in the Mongolian people's hearts. With a sense of deep gratitude the troops of the MPA and the entire Mongolian people will this spring be celebrating the 45th anniversary of the USSR Armed Forces' and Soviet people's Great Victory.

Soviet forces are returning home after performing with honor their noble, international duty. In the anxious, difficult years of the cold war we had our Soviet friends with us. I believe that it is impossible to overestimate the sigfnificance of this from the political and psychological viewpoint and as a matter of principle. The Soviet troops erected installations and apartment blocks, laid a railroad, and gave Mongolian stockraisers a great deal of assistance during natural calamities. By collaborating with their Soviet brothers-in-arms our troops borrowed much of value from their wealth of experience.

All in all I believe that the Soviet forces temporarily stationed in our country have made a significant contribution to strengthening cooperation between the fraternal peoples and combat comradeship between their armies.

Commentary Views Japanese Election Outcome

OW2402022390 Moscow in Japanese to Japan 1200 GMT 19 Feb 90

[Tokyo correspondent Potapov report]

[Text] In Japan, the results of the general election for the House of Representatives held on 18 February have been made public. In this connection, Radio Moscow Tokyo correspondent Potapov has filed by telephone the following report:

[Potapov is heard briefly speaking in Russian fading into Japanese translation] A smile has once again appeared on the face of Prime Minister Kaifu, who is also the president of the Liberal Democratic Party [LDP]. Hundreds of TV and other cameras captured Prime Minister Kaifu's smiles at his press conference held at the LDP headquarters on the morning of 19 February [as heard]. At the press conference, Prime Minister Kaifu said that the LDP had been in a serious crisis during the past few month, but that the party was able to overcome the crisis and tide over the severe test of the election.

It is true that the LDP has decreased its seats by 25 as compared with the outcome of the last election. However, by winning 275 seats, the LDP can now maintain a comfortable majority. It is expected that soon, the LDP will further expand its force by adding several successful independent candidates to the party. It goes without saying that the outcome is advantageous to Prime Minister Kaifu. Thanks to the outcome, the issue on removing Prime Minister Kaifu from his post will be detached from the LDP's agenda for the time being.

In the 18 February general election, the Japan Socialist Party [JSP] won a great success and retained its position as the primary major opposition party. The JSP has won 136 seats, an increase of 53 seats. Following the last election for the House of Councillors, the results of the current election for the House of Representatives indicate that the Socialist Party's popularity has been growing in Japan. At the same time, as pointed out by JSP Chairperson Takako Doi at the 19 February press conference, the JSP leadership felt that it was regrettable that the opposition parties had failed in winning the majority at the House of Representatives election so that they could open up a new page in the history of Japan's politics.

In fact, the election outcome indicates that due to the JSP's success, all other opposition parties have conspicuously retrogressed. The Komeito, which had 54 seats

prior to the election, lost nine seats in the current election. The Japan Communist Party has retrogressed by a greater margin, with its seats reduced from 26 to 16. Also suffering a defeat, the Democratic Socialist Party [DSP] succeeded in winning only 14 seats.

According to observers, the major cause for the opposition's defeat lies in the fact that the opposition parties were not able to indicate to voters what policies they would work out to replace the LDP by establishing a coalition administration which had been talked about for many years; it was generally observed that they might have had such a chance this time.

The outcome of the general election has aroused the great attention of the Japanese mass media and also of the public. It is expected that hot debates will be held between the ruling and opposition parties at the Diet sessions on the very unpopular consumption tax, which has been introduced through the LDP's proposal. All the opposition parties are determined to oppose the consumption tax bill, and have stated their intention to abolish it.

Perhaps, Mr. Kaifu once again will be elected as LDP president. The ruling party will work out plans, and attempt to split the opposition front. For this purpose, the LDP will probably hold individual negotiations with various opposition parties whenever a bill is submitted for examination, and try to win them over as its supporters. This was the LDP's usual practice in the past.

Meanwhile, the Diet is still in a complicated situation because the House of Councillors is now under the control of the opposition forces. Observers do not deny the possibility that under such circumstances, the LDP will have to think about forming a coalition administration with the middle-of-the-road Komeito and DSP.

The current election outcome indicates there is a tendency in Japan to form a two-party system in the future, and it has been stated that this tendency may become stronger and stronger. Future developments in the situation will clarify whether this prediction will be realized or not.

Japan's Increasing Military Burdens Examined

OW0903100790 Moscow in Japanese to Japan 1000 GMT 8 Mar 90

[Kalinin commentary]

[Text] As reported before, U.S. Secretary of Defense Cheney in an interview with CNN Television a few days ago insisted that Japan should take over all costs for maintaining U.S. military bases in Japan. Regarding this, military commentator Kalinin writes as follows:

This question of taking over costs for maintenance of U.S. military bases in Japan apparently is not a simple matter for Japanese official authorities. For instance, as seen during Prime Minister Kaifu's recent meeting with U.S. President Bush, Japan on one hand is indicating to the U.S. side a willingness to make concessions on the matter, but she faces on the other hand the problem of needing to have the Japan-U.S. agreement on military bases revised or a special agreement concluded and have it approved by the Diet.

To obtain Diet approval for such an agreement is considered very difficult—particularly when we remember that the ruling Liberal Democratic Party failed to muster a majority in the last Upper House election. There are other reasons. Let us recall that Japan used to pay for up to a half of wages for Japanese employees of the military bases, but is now paying for all the costs of the wages. The pay amounts to about $2.8 billion. This means that Japan at present is already bearing more costs for upkeep of U.S. forces than any other allied country of the United States.

However, as evident from remarks of Secretary of Defense Cheney, the United States wants Japan to increase its burdens and take over all costs of maintaining military bases, with the sole exception of the pay of officers and men of the U.S. Armed Services. Consequently, the burdens for Japan will swell to almost $4.5 billion, leading to the expansion of Japan's overall military spending. Such developments will bring no benefits to Japan at all and instead can bring negative effects on Japan's economy.

Let us take a look at the daily THE NEW YORK TIMES. THE NEW YORK TIMES rightly pointed out that exhorbitant U.S. military spending is one of the reasons why it has come to lose its economic supremacy over Japan and other countries. It is not difficult to see that behind the U.S. desire to shift its exhorbitant military burdens to Japan there is the aim of weakening the power of Japan, which is the major U.S. competitor in trade and economy.

Of course, we cannot ignore the pure military aspect of the matter either. The practice of observing 1 percent of the GNP as the ceiling for military spending was broken when Nakasone was in power, but accepting the request to take over the costs for upkeep of U.S. forces in Japan will mean complete rejection of the principle of the 1 percent GNP ceiling, which still functions as a brake, and in fact will open the way for military spending to increase without limitation.

The idea of the 1 percent ceiling to limit military spending is something that has been praised as a symbol of Japan, a peace-loving country. To remove some sort of restriction on military spending is bound to result in the increased concerns of Asian nations about Japan becoming a military power. It is so clear that consequently the international prestige of Japan will fall.

Let us view another point. The Soviet Union at the third UN General Assembly session on arms reduction proposed complete the withdrawal of foreign troops on the territories of other nations, thus eliminating foreign military bases or a foreign military presence by the year

2000. More recently, it has taken concrete actions in this respect, agreeing on the deadline for complete withdrawal of Soviet troops from Czechoslovakia and Mongolia. Negotiations are now under way with Hungary for a similar purpose. The Soviet Union has made it clear that it is willing to withdraw its troops from Poland, and has taken the action of reducing its military presence on Cam Ranh Bay in Vietnam.

If we take these actions Into account and if we desire to see military tensions alleviated, it may be only logical to say that other countries—naturally the United States—first of all, should learn from the examples set by the Soviet Union. Japan, with the largest number of U.S. troops stationed in its country of any nation in Asia may be able to make forward-looking contributions with this question.

We do not think it necessary to prove again that the increase of burdens for the upkeep of U.S. forces being pressed by U.S. military authorities at the Pentagon has no bearing at all on the important task of alleviating military tensions.

Southeast Asia & Pacific

Commentator Examines Solutions to Cambodian Issue

OW1703053490 Moscow International Service in Mandarin 1400 GMT 9 Mar 90

[From the "Current Events and Commentaries" program]

[Text] Now that another round of informal meetings on the Cambodian question has ended and the participants are leaving, some observers wonder if these meetings were worthwhile. Some say that the failure of this round should have been expected. Station commentator Nikolayev writes:

This logic will lead to the conclusion that the Cambodian conflicts are still unsolvable. We should not give up, but should redouble our efforts to solve the Cambodian question. I think there are favorable conditions for solving this problem. Although the Pol Pot elements negated the final documents adopted in Jakarta, they cannot, no matter how much they want to, completely obliterate the achievements made in seeking a political solution. Look at the dialogue between the rival Cambodian factions. This dialogue has never stopped, as demonstrated by the recent meeting between Cambodian head of state Hun Sen and Prince Sihanouk. I want to point out that both sides agreed to establish a national supreme council in Cambodia, involve the United Nations in the solution of the Cambodian question, and incorporate this point into the UN Communique. Hun Sen and Sihanouk also agreed to further discuss these questions.

Observers pin hopes on the meeting of the five permanent members of the UN Security Council scheduled for the end of March. At that meeting, the five powers will discuss the specific missions of the United Nations in solving the Cambodian disputes. In their last meeting in February this year, they acquired understanding on some important questions such as the necessity of bringing about a ceasefire in Cambodia and stopping foreign military assistance to the warring factions. They also discussed disarmament of the warring Cambodian factions.

We cannot completely rule out the possibility of holding a new informal meeting on Cambodia. The failure of the recent round in Jakarta does not mean that this form of negotiation is useless.

The situation dictates that further steps be taken and common efforts made to normalize the situation within and around Cambodia. I completely agree with the view of Thai Foreign Minister Sitthi. At the conclusion of the Jakarta meeting, he said that the refusal to promote a peaceful solution to the Cambodian disputes will mean the continuation of military actions.

Commentary Views Cambodian Peace Process

BK1503101590 Moscow in Cambodian to Cambodia 1100 GMT 14 Mar 90

[Oleg Shchedrov commentary]

[Text] The third meeting of foreign ministers of the five permanent members of the UN Security Council has concluded in Paris.

According to reports from foreign press agencies, the meeting participants were moving toward a compromise on a number of issues concerning the participation of the United Nations in the process of settling the Cambodian problem. A resolution was adopted at the conclusion of the meeting. Our commentator Oleg Shchedrov has the following comments:

A resolution was adopted, but we do not yet have a copy of it and therefore are unable to analyze the matter in detail. However, I would like to say that the approval of the resolution is reason enough to celebrate. It is well known that the meeting of the representatives of the five superpowers in New York in February ended badly because the delegates continually criticized one another and made countless exigencies.

We are hopeful that at this meeting all obstacles were removed. No one at the meeting rejected the necessity of a UN participation in the process of settling the Cambodian problem. The contending Cambodian parties also agree with this. Namibia, which will proclaim its independence on 21 March, is an encouraging example.

Concrete measures are detailed in Australian Foreign Minister Evans' plan. At present, attention is being focused on the political involvement of the United Nations, in particular during the transitional period. The

question of Cambodia's administration remains unresolved. Should the existing government in Cambodia remain in place, or should it be dissolved with the power given to a UN administration and a national supreme organ with representation from all Cambodian parties? Cambodian Prime Minister Comrade Hun Sen advocates the implementation of the first approach, and has stressed that: We do not care about a lack of support in future elections, but we do worry about the loss of the country's sovereignty which could happen if the administration of Cambodia is given to the United Nations. The opposition demands the dissolution of the government led by Comrade Hun Sen prior to elections in the country.

Only time is needed for the Cambodian parties to compromise. The latest informal inter-Cambodian meeting showed that the Cambodian parties are not willing to make concessions. However, it is hoped that the Paris meeting brings the Cambodian parties to a meeting arranged within the framework of the resolution adopted by the five permanent members of the UN Security Council. This will likely bring about a successful result, Comrade Oleg Shchedrov said in conclusion.

Near East & South Asia

Pakistan, USSR To Continue POW Efforts

BK1703020090 Islamabad Domestic Service in Urdu 0100 GMT 17 Mar 90

[Text] Pakistan and the Soviet Union have expressed their readiness to continue efforts for talks aimed at the organization of a broad-based government in Afghanistan. Both sides also agreed to continue ministerial-level talks on resolving the issue of Soviet POW's in a humanitarian spirit. This was decided during a meeting between Pakistani Foreign Secretary Tanvir Ahmad Khan and Soviet Deputy Foreign Minister Yuliy Vorontsov in Moscow.

Commentary Views Request for Tanay's Extradition

TA1603175690 Moscow in Dari to Afghanistan 1500 GMT 16 Mar 90

[Yuriy Andreyev commentary from "The World Today" program]

[Excerpts] Dear listeners: The Afghan Government has requested the extradition of former Defense Minister Shahnawaz Tanay and 16 other participants from Pakistan so that they can be put on trial. The Republic of Afghanistan Foreign Ministry's note also contains a request for the return of the plane in which Shahnawaz Tanay and his followers fled from the country. Our commentator, Yuriy Andreyev, writes the following:

Now that the tragic events in Kabul are getting more remote from us in time, the dimensions of the military plot, which resulted in the death of 95 civilians and the injury of another 172 persons, are becoming more prominent. It is clear that the coup attempt was the outcome of a so-called well-thought-out marriage contract between three different forces, each pursuing its own political aims.

Facts indicate that, in addition to Shahnawaz Tanay, who directed this plot, senior army circles, Golbuddin Hekmatyar, and representatives of the Pakistani Army were also involved in these events. Certainly the participation of so many forces in the plot was not accidental, and it may require one to carefully study the reasons for their actions. Shahnawaz Tanay's political ambitions were not a secret to anyone in Kabul. [passage omitted]

Golbuddin Hekmatyar is another story. This 42-year-old leader of Hezb-e Eslami Afghanistan aimed to exploit the rebellion in Kabul for his own malicious political objectives. As is known, he had resigned from the makeup of the opposition interim government and was in some sort of a political limbo. At present, he is clearly seeking ways to extricate himself from such a situation. Tanay's plot provided him with the opportunity to raise the concept of forming the so-called revolutionary council in which both the so-called mujahidin and the Afghan Army personnel who rebelled against Najibullah would be represented. It may be that Hekmatyar intended to be the chairman of this council, thus gaining political capital. But all the other members of the seven-party alliance opposed this concept. For example, Mojaddedi, the chairman of this alliance, accused Hekmatyar of cooperating with the enemy and forming a united front with the People's Democratic Party of Afghanistan.

Meanwhile, Pakistan, where the irreconcilable opposition is headquartered, is in no hurry to determine the fate of Shahnawaz Tanay. The interest of Pakistan's intelligence service and army in the aborted coup attempt has been reported earlier. Thus, with the crushing of the coup, Pakistan's policy, which is aimed at supporting a civil war in Afghanistan, has faced another defeat. Of course, they may not repatriate Tanay to Kabul, but his fading political activity will not be altered by this development.

Afghan Shiites' Meeting in Tehran Detailed

NC1603125090 Moscow Radio Peace and Progress in Persian to Iran 1530 GMT 15 Mar 90

[Station commentary]

[Text] The so-called Supreme Assembly of Afghan Shiites held a three-day session in Tehran. Military commanders of the armed groups of the Iranian-based Nine-Party Alliance, clergy, and politicians attended this session and discussed the Afghan Shiites' unity during the current phase of searching for solutions to the country's problems. Our commentator writes:

Both the Afghan guests and the hospitable Iranian hosts, who helped organize the session, naturally tried to learn from the recent aborted coup attempt in Kabul. What did this failure show? Once again it showed how the

extremist Afghan opposition relies on force to seize power. Such efforts have been repeatedly thwarted. The so-called mujahidin were defeated when they tried to occupy Jalalabad, Qandahar, Khost, and other Afghan cities. At the same time, they are unable to overthrow Afghan's legal government through anti-state plots. Thus, only one realistic path remains: talks with the current Afghan leadership to establish a coalition government with broad participation. However, the so-called mujahidin ignore this solution.

Some of the leaders of the Seven-Party Alliance and their Pakistani mentors broke a promise they had with the Nine-Party Alliance and Iran. After all, it was almost on the eve of the coup attempt that talks were held between the Seven- and Nine-Party Alliance leaders in Tehran. These talks were for holding elections in the territory controlled by the opposition in Afghanistan. During these talks, the pro-Iranian so-called mujahidin groups were promised that the division of power in these territories and in the future coalition government of Afghanistan would be just.

The Pakistanis agreed to act as a guarantor of these promises, but what really happened? The Pakistani militarists, by leaning on Hekmatyar's extremist group and the adventurists in Kabul's current coalition government, strived to bring a dictatorship they favored to power in Afghanistan. Naturally, the interests of the Nine-Party Alliance, Iran, and the moderate leaders of the Peshawar-based Seven-Party Alliance were not considered in these calculations. Moreover, they forgot the promises they had made to their allies in Iran.

It is not surprising that under these conditions, the Afghan Shiite opposition has expressed its mistrust in the oath-breaching Pakistani allies and is trying to find a way to influence the situation in the country. The important thing is that this influence ends the bloodshed and establishes peace and stability. The Afghan nation is tired of the war. This nation wants to live and to work in a calm and secure atmosphere and wants to overcome the immense material and cultural damages that have been inflicted on the country during the many years of bloodshed.

The people expect the leaders of political forces, who are involved in the conflict, to make responsible and wise decisions. I think that after the withdrawal of the Soviet Armed Forces, the Afghan opposition's conflicts with the government armed forces can only be assessed as fratricide and nothing else.

Iranian Media Reaction to Soviet Congress Noted

NC1603185090 Moscow Radio Peace and Progress in Persian to Iran 1530 GMT 16 Mar 90

[Station commentary]

[Excerpts] The Iranian mass media is commenting emotionally on the third extraordinary Congress of the Soviet People's Deputies. JOMHURI-YE ESLAMI points to the decision by the Congress to introduce an addendum to the Soviet Constitution on the basis of which the monopoly of rule is taken away from the Communist Party. The newspaper believes that this is a basic step toward the democratization of the country. At the same time, the newspaper believes that abandoning the one-party system allegedly marks the end of the era of communism in the Soviet Union. [passage omitted]

Reactions in the Iranian mass media differ about the abrogation of that paragraph in the Constitution which refers to the Communist Party's leadership. This is because Iranian society itself is made up of different parts. There are those who oppose developments and are glued to the past political system, which is ruled by the monopoly of power exercised by representatives of the privileged clergymen. These are the people who either obstruct the introduction of the law on political parties or try to render this law meaningless. These are the people who want to preserve a situation in which state rule will continue to maintain its strong control over the people's thoughts and behavior and will pitilessly persecute opponents.

Despite the political and ideological differences between the Soviet Union and Iran, they had something in common until recently: the domination by the privileged minority, irrespective of whether this was a domination by a ruling political party or by a religious organization. Neither the Soviet nor the Iranian people favor such a management method, as life shows.

Foreign Ministry Official Pays Visit to Aden

LD1603155390 Moscow TASS in English 1327 GMT 16 Mar 90

[Text] Aden March 16 TASS—Vladimir Polyakov, Soviet Foreign Ministry Middle East and Northern Africa Department head, held talks with 'Abd-al-'Aziz al-Dali, foreign minister of the People's Democratic Republic of Yemen.

Polyakov was also received by Salim Salih Muhammad, deputy general secretary of the Yemen Socialist Party Central Committee, and President Haydar Abu-Bakr al-'Attas.

Polyakov and Muhammad discussed regional and world issues, and bilateral relations between the Yemen Socialist Party and the Soviet Communist Party.

Muhammad voiced concern over the emigration of Soviet Jews to Israel, asking the Soviet leadership to intervene in order prevent them from settling in the occupied Arab territories.

Polyakov handed the Yemeni president a message from the Soviet leadership on bilateral relations, the situation in the world and several other issues of mutual interest.

The Soviet leadership expressed support for Yemeni reunification.

Polyakov and Al-'Attas discussed Soviet-Yemeni cooperation and ways of expanding it, as well as the situation in the Arab world and in the international arena.

The two sides talked about the situation in the Middle East. They called for peaceful measures to implement the rights of the Palestinian people for self-determination and for setting up an independent state by calling an international conference under the aegis of the United Nations.

They also discussed several international issues and the policy of the two countries in the light of new political thinking.

Al-'Attas praised the Soviet policy towards the People's Democratic Republic of Yemen.

He expressed certainty that the Soviet Union will extend its support to a united Yemen as well, "as was always the case in the Soviet Union's relations with the Yemeni people."

The president asked Polyakov to convey his greetings to the Soviet leadership.

Polyakov Meets 'Ali Salim al-Bid

LD1703233790 Moscow TASS in English 2130 GMT 17 Mar 90

[Text] Aden March 18 TASS—Visiting chief of the Soviet Foreign Ministry's Middle East and Northern African Directorate Vladimir Polyakov met on Saturday General Secretary of the Yemeni Socialist Party Central Committee 'Ali Salim al-Bid.

Earlier in the day he also met Chairman of the Presidium of the Supreme People's Council Haydar Abu-Bakr al-'Attas and Foreign Minister 'Abd-al-'Aziz al-Dali.

The leaders of the People's Democratic Republic of Yemen favoured revolutionary transformations in the Soviet Union in the spirit of perestroyka and peaceful foreign policy, note the importance of the development and perfection of Soviet-Yemeni relations and briefed the visitor about the unification process between the two Yemeni states.

Claims of Fire at Libyan Plant Examined

PM1603145590 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 16 Mar 90 Morning Edition p 7

[IZVESTIYA Press Service report followed by own correspondent A. Portanskiy dispatch under the general heading: "Libya: Fire at Chemical Plant"]

[Text] A fire broke out at a chemical plant at Rabitah (Libya), 80 km from Tripoli, Wednesday.

The news of the fire attracted the broad attention of the world's press, as last week the White House accused Libya of producing chemical weapons at the plant. Statements by U.S. official spokesmen at the time did not rule out the possibility of a U.S. military action against Libya. The Libyan leadership in turn denied the reports that toxins were being manufactured at Rabitah.

Reporters who intercepted President G. Bush in a White House corridor Wednesday tried to ascertain whether the United States had a hand in the fire. The President categorically denied U.S. involvement in any action against Libya.

White House spokesman M. Fitzwater maintained that the United States, having received news of the fire from foreign embassies, was trying to verify its authenticity. He also said that Libya had closed its borders.

In Tunis a representative of Libya's JANA news agency told a REUTER correspondent that the fire, which started Wednesday morning, might have been caused by U.S. or Israeli sabotage. At the same time the Israeli ambassador in Paris declared that Israel had not carried out an attack on Rabitah.

Meanwhile it was reported from Rome that a passenger aircraft of the Italian airline had flown to Tripoli as scheduled Thursday. It may be inferred from this that the reports of Libya's borders being closed do not tally with reality.

Algiers—The Libyan authorities have not yet reported on the scale of the destruction or on casualties at Rabitah.

At the same time it is clear that the events at Rabitah are complicating the already strained relations between Washington and Tripoli. The United States took an interest in that installation approximately two years ago. The CIA director claimed in October 1988 that the Rabitah plant was the largest of all the enterprises for the production of chemical weapons that the Americans had yet succeeded in detecting in the world. Three months later THE NEW YORK TIMES wrote that in the eighties an Iraqi engineer had been recruiting Western partners to work at Rabitah. Libya maintained that the plant produces insecticides.

'Vremya' Announcer Condemns Bazoft Execution

LD1703222590 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1800 GMT 17 Mar 90

[From the "Vremya" newscast, presented by Yevgeniy Kiselev]

[Text] Yesterday, while reporting the execution of the British journalist, our colleagues from IZVESTIYA remarked fairly that Soviet journalists probably have no right to judge the extent to which the accusations levelled at Farzad Bazoft were justified, but nevertheless expressed their firm conviction that the execution of a journalist is a step that is totally unacceptable in the civilized world. For my part, I would add that this is particularly true of a foreign journalist. I would not take it upon myself to comment on behalf of all our colleagues

in the Soviet Union, but I do want to say that both I and many of my comrades in television share the viewpoint of IZVESTIYA.

Sub-Saharan Africa

Shevardnadze Continues Tour of African Countries

Shevardnadze Cited on Peace in Angola

AU1903164590 Paris AFP in English 1608 GMT 19 Mar 90

[Text] Lisbon, March 19 (AFP)—Peace could be achieved in Angola's 15-year civil war by June, Soviet Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze said Monday after talks in Luanda with President Jose Eduardo dos Santos and opposite number Pedro de Castro Van Dunem Loy. "It is not impossible, given the dynamic and rapid developments" in the world, he said, quoted by the Portuguese news agency LUSA.

Moscow was ready to work for an urgent solution, but its ability to intervene was limited because of lack of contacts with the U.S.-backed rebel movement UNITA [National Union for the Total Independence of Angola], Mr. Shevardnadze said.

He would be discussing the Angolan issue with his U.S. counterpart James Baker when they attended Namibia's independence ceremonies this week, he said.

Shevardnadze Meets Dos Santos

LD1903143790 Moscow TASS in English 1422 GMT 19 Mar 90

[Text] Luanda March 19 TASS—Soviet Foreign Minister Eduard Sehvardnadze's brief working visit to the People's Republic of Angola continues.

This morning, Shevardnadze laid a wreath at the sarcophagus of Angolan First President Antonio Agostinho Neto.

On the same day, the Soviet guest was received by Angolan President and Chairman of the MPLA [Popular Movement for the Liberation of Angola] Workers' Party Jose Eduardo dos Santos. The talk focused on global and regional issues and Soviet-Angolan relations.

Shevardnadze-Dos Santos Talks Held

LD1903214890 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1907 GMT 19 Mar 90

[Text] Luanda, 19 Mar (TASS)—E.A. Shevardnadze, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and USSR minister of foreign affairs, completed a working visit to the People's Republic of Angola on 18-19 March.

The Soviet minister was received by J. dos Santos, the president of Angola, and held a detailed conversation with him, during which a number of international problems and matters of bilateral Soviet-Angolan relations were considered in broad terms of principle. Cordial greetings and good wishes from the USSR President M.S. Gorbachev were conveyed to the people of the Angolan People's Republic.

J. dos Santos gave a high appraisal of the visit to Angola and other African countries by the USSR minister of foreign affairs. The very fact of such a visit refutes the comments which are occasionally heard that the USSR, occupied with its own domestic affairs, is allegedly losing interest in the countries of the "Third World."

E.A. Shevardnadze confirmed that relations with the developing countries, especially with Angola and other long-standing friends of the USSR continue to occupy an important place in Soviet foreign policy. Energetically and effectively maintaining a course toward overcoming the confrontational trends in world politics, and towards a real reduction in the arsenals of the world, the USSR confidently proceeds from the position that this also corresponds to the interests of "Third World" countries.

The improvement of relations between East and West makes it possible to work productively on the settlement of regional conflicts, a shining example of which is the forthcoming Namibian declaration of independence.

J. dos Santos shared such an appraisal and stated Angola's complete support for the USSR's active and peaceful foreign policy course.

With great satisfaction, the interlocutors noted the weighty and constructive contribution which the USSR and Angola have made to the struggle to eliminate the last colony on the African Continent, which is without doubt an event of historical importance. The independence of Namibia and the positive processes taking place in South Africa are creating new and more favorable conditions in southern Africa, including as regards the advancement of an internal Angolan settlement.

J. dos Santos gave a detailed report on the situation in Angola and the situation taking shape around the settlement. It was with great satisfaction that the Soviet side received the statement by the Angolan president on the principled adherence by the Angolan leadership to a peaceful, political solution.

The account by the Soviet minister on the current stage of restructuring in the USSR and the measures being taken to overcome negative phenomena, to ensure decisive progress, proceeding among other things from the enormous international significance of the success of the policy of renewal, was listened to with great friendly interest. The introduction of new economic mechanisms in the USSR creates additional opportunities for developing contemporary forms of Soviet-Angolan cooperation, ensuring its effectiveness and mutually beneficial nature, that is for implementing its consistent modernization, the strategic course toward which was set during the meetings between M.S. Gorbachev and J. Dos Santos in Moscow in October 1986. This in turn will help to

resolve the problem of indebtedness, taking account of those difficulties brought about by the continuing conflict in Angola.

The sides were united that Soviet-Angolan interaction is called upon to continue to be a constructive political factor in southern Africa and, in broader terms, that it is capable of continuing to play a useful role in implementing the tasks facing the peoples of the two friendly states.

E.A. Shevardnadze held talks with the Angolan minister of foreign affairs, P. Van Dunen. They were devoted in the main to matching the positions of the sides on a wide range of problems of contemporary world policy. In this, a significant degree of coincidence in the approaches and views was revealed. Having devoted their main attention to the situation in southern Africa, the ministers also analyzed the dynamically developing situation in Europe, in particular in connection with the prospect of the unification of Germany, and considered the state of affairs in some other regions. A number of specific issues of Soviet-Angolan bilateral cooperation were also the subject of the ministers' discussion.

The need to maintain close Soviet-Angolan contacts at various levels was stressed. E.A. Shevardnadze invited P. Van Dunen to pay an official visit to the USSR. The invitation was accepted with gratitude.

On concluding his meeting with Angolan President J. dos Santos Eduard Shevardnadze stated to journalists that the conversation with the Angolan leader was useful and interesting. I think, he said, that this conversation is a landmark [etapnoye] in Soviet-Angolan relations. "We have a good and full mutual understanding on acute international problems, and common views with respect to the situation in the region", the minister stressed.

Eduard Shevardnadze commented that the Soviet leadership fully shares the Angolan president's views on the path toward an internal settlement. I am fully satisfied with the words of the president that national reconciliation and political methods to resolve this matter constitute the general course of the country's leadership, the minister pointed out. Such opportunities exist, Eduard Shevardnadze stressed. "I have again been convinced that the president and the leadership of Angola want peace for their people and for their country. After peace has been established, it will be possible to resolve all those difficult problems which are arising in the economy and in the social sphere".

Shevardnadze Departs for Zambia

LD1903154290 Moscow TASS in English 1503 GMT 19 Mar 90

[Text] Luanda March 13 TASS—Upon the conclusion of the first lap of his tour of African countries, Soviet Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze left Luanda for the Zambian capital, Lusaka, today. Shevardnadze was staying in Angola on a brief working visit. Shevardnadze was seen off from the February 4 International Airport by Angolan Foreign Minister Pedro de Castro Van Dunem. Soviet Ambassador to Angola V. Kazimirov was among the send-off party.

This is Shevardnadze's first tour of African countries. He will also visit Namibia, Mozambique, Zimbabwe, Tanzania and Nigeria. The highlight of his tour will be the participation in the festivities on the occasion of the proclamation of Namibia's independence.

Arrival in Zambia Reported

LD1903213190 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1750 GMT 19 Mar 90

[By TASS correspondents Vladimir Zbaratskiy and Georgiy Shmelev]

[Text] Lusaka, 19 Mar (TASS)—E.A. Shevardnadze, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and USSR foreign minister, has today arrived in the Zambian capital from Luanda on a brief working visit. At Lusaka International Airport he was met by Luke Mwananshiku, Zambian minister of foreign affairs, other officials, O.S. Miroshkhin, USSR ambassador to Zambia, and Soviet Embassy representatives.

Zambia is the second stage of the nine-day journey by the head of the Soviet foreign policy across the countries of Africa. E.A Shevardnadze has arrived from Angola, where he has conducted negotiations with Jose Eduardo dos Santos, president of the People's Republic of Angola, Pedro de Castro Van Dunem, Angolan foreign minister, and other officials on a wide range of international and regional problems, and bilateral relations.

South African Changes 'Irreversible'

LD2003100490 Moscow World Service in English 0800 GMT 20 Mar 90

[Excerpt] Soviet Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze has said that perestroyka and democratization in his country had an impact on its foreign policy. Speaking on Monday in Lusaka on the eve of talks with President Kenneth Kaunda of Zambia, he described changes occurring in the world scene as tremendous and deplored the fact that not everyone realized it. This relates to some figures in South Africa, said the Soviet foreign minister. Nevertheless, Eduard Shevardnadze said that changes in South Africa were irreversible. [passage omitted]

Shevardnadze, Zambia's Kaunda Meet

LD2003100890 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0845 GMT 20 Mar 90

[Text] Lusaka, 20 Mar (TASS)—Talks between Kenneth Kaunda, president of Zambia, and E.A. Shevardnadze, member of the Politburo of the CPSU Central Committee and USSR minister of foreign affairs, who is making a short working visit to that country, began on Monday with an unscheduled one-on-one meeting. This

is the second stage in the head of the Soviet foreign policy department's nine-day tour of African countries. He has been to Angola and is also to visit Namibia, where he is to take part in celebrations marking the declaration of Namibian independence. He is to visit Mozambique, Tanzania, and Nigeria. This is the first trip to the countries of Africa south of the Sahara by a Soviet foreign minister in the history of Soviet-African relations.

Before the second round of talks had started, President K. Kaunda made a statement for media representatives. The visit of the USSR minister of foreign affairs, he said, "is a very longed-for visit, as we have a chance to welcome M.S. Gorbachev's ally. The Soviet leader's policy inspires sincere admiration not only in Zambia, but in the world as a whole. His political activity is shaped by the interests of the whole of humankind. Why have I started with words of gratitude to M.S. Gorbachev? The other day I made a program speech and devoted 40 minutes to the USSR president's activities. The thing is that the program of perestroyka started by the Soviet leader is changing the world, literally before our very eyes. This policy has replaced confrontation with cooperation, and its current results are impressive evidence of what has already been achieved over the last five years. In October 1987 I met M.S. Gorbachev in the Kremlin. I was greatly impressed then by his adherence to solving international problems by political methods. I asked him then—what about the situation in the south of Africa? And he said that the policy he supports is valid for that part of the continent, too. Frankly speaking, I had doubts about the correctness of his words then, but now it is clear to what extent they were true. Speaking about the USSR stand on the south of Africa, K. Kaunda remarked that Zambian leadership is satisfied with this policy. One would like to mention in particular the importance of Soviet-American rapprochement after G. Bush's administration entered into power. K. Kaunda remarked that, in his view, the U.S. President's position is now determined by adherence to the cause of peace. I think, the Zambian president continued, that all the peoples of the world are linking their future with the current improvement of U.S.-USSR relations.

This visit, noted the Zambian president in conclusion, enables us to exchange opinions on the broadest range of issues, and on our bilateral relations. We take pride in the friendship between our peoples, based as it is on fundamentals of principle.

The Soviet minister conveyed M.S. Gorbachev's best wishes to the Zambian president and the whole of the Zambian people. He noted the great significance of the traditional ties of friendship between the Soviet and African peoples, and the solidarity and support of very prominent leaders of the black continent, such as Kenneth Kaunda. E.A. Shevardnadze noted that the processes of reforming life that are taking place at the present moment affect not only the USSR, but other countries, too, including southern Africa. Of course, remarked the Soviet minister, what is going on there today is not yet a revolution, but in my opinion the processes developing in southern Africa are irreversible in nature. E.A. Shevardnadze concurred with the opinion of the Zambian president that the normalization of relations between the USSR and the United States is helping to improve the situation in the world. This dialogue is becoming more and more productive.

After the talks ended, the Zambian president replied to questions from a TASS correspondent. "Our conversation was extremely useful and constructive. We discussed a great range of regional and global problems, and, to a lesser extent, bilateral relations were touched upon. This was because the USSR and Zambia hold views in common on the essence of problems. E.A. Shevardnadze is continuing on his tour of the countries of southern Africa, and we hope that his visits will prove extremely productive. The Zambian leadership wishes him every success during his stay in our region."

Shevardnadze Leaves for Namibia

LD2003134990 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1240 GMT 20 Mar 90

[Text] E.A. Shevardnadze had a conversation in Lusaka with the leadership of the African National Congress [ANC] of South Africa, headed by Alfred Nzo, ANC secretary general. In the course of the meeting, the importance of settling the internal situation in that country as soon as possible and attaining a compromise on the path toward constructive talks between the ANC and the Republic of South Africa Government was pointed out.

Today E.A. Shevardnadze, who was in Zambia for a short visit, left Lusaka for Windhoek to attend the celebrations on the occasion of Namibia's independence.

At Lusaka's international airport the Soviet visitor was seen off by Luke Mwananshiku, Zambian minister of foreign affairs, and other officils. O.S. Miroshkin, USSR ambassador in Zambia, was among those seeing him off.

Arrival in Namibia Reported

LD2003144190 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1420 GMT 20 Mar 90

[Text] Windhoek, 20 March (TASS)—Eduard Shevardnadze, minister of foreign affairs of the USSR, arrived here today to participate in the ceremonies to mark Namibia's declaration of independence.

Call for UN Troops To Stay in Namibia Noted

PM2003125790 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 19 Mar 90 Second Edition p 4

[Dispatch by PRAVDA correspondent I. Tarutin: "'Blue Helmets' Still Needed"]

[Text] Harare, 18 Mar—UN Secretary General J. Perez de Cuellar has asked the Security Council to urgently

consider the question of extending the UN forces' presence in Namibia after the country acquires its freedom 21 March.

Zambian President K. Kaunda, chairman of the "front-line" states grouping, for instance, has made the following proposal. He set the desirable timeframe at around three months.

The UN contingent numbered approximately 4,500 military observers and another 1,500 policemen. Stationed in the country during its transition to independence, they monitored the process of decolonialization; once it is completed, they have to be completely evacuated within a fortnight. Many have already left Namibia.

However, suggestions are now being made that some subunits should remain for the time being to ensure order until the process of forming a national army and police force has been completed. Engineering troops could also offer substantial aid. Thus, an Australian battalion has carried out work to remove mines in northern parts of the country where there had been guerrilla warfare. It has not proved possible to clear the vast areas completely in the short time available.

Fierce Fighting, Food Aid to Ethiopia Viewed

EA1803163690 Moscow International Service in Swahili 1730 GMT 16 Mar 90

[Text] Nations of the world are closely watching the situation in northern Ethiopia. Following an escalation of fierce fighting between the government forces and its opponents, a serious threat of famine for the people in the region has arisen. Emergency efforts are needed to transport food for the people. The Soviet and U.S. Governments have agreed to cooperate in distributing emergency food aid to the residents of the war-ravaged regions. Here are further details from Maksim Yevgenyev:

The major issue at stake is whether it will possible to ensure a permament form of food transportation to the famine-stricken people, or whether we shall see a repetition of the 1984-85 disaster, when thousands of people perished. An even greater problem for Ethiopia than the search for countries ready to give aid—since similar exercises have been carried out in the past—is to ensure that aid is received by residents in areas controlled by the rebels, and by those living in areas besieged by rebel forces. The route used in the past from the port of Mitsiwa to the Eritrean regional capital, Asmera, and to other areas in the north, cannot be used now, since it has been closed following attacks by the Eritrean People's Liberation Front, who are fighting for the regions's secession from Ethiopia. This problem has left only one option: the long route of food convoys beginning at Aseb, a port further south on the Red Sea. But even transportation on this route has been beset by a big obstacle, which is a line of opposition between the government and its opponents. According to reports from Ethiopia, rebel leaders have declined to allow food trucks to pass through to the famine-stricken areas.

Following their concern over the plight of the people in the famine-stricken areas, the USSR and the United States have made joint efforts to save the affected people. UN delegates from the two countries have urged the two sides in the internal conflict in Ethiopia to provide secure routes international food aid being provided under UN supervision. It is also expected that the United Nations will provide air transport to the famine-stricken areas. But a priority aim is to put a stop to the fighting and bring the situation in northern Ethiopia back to normal. Under these circumstances, the USSR supports the stance of the Ethiopian government, that any plans of countries and international agencies to assist Ethiopia by providing food aid cannot alter the right of the government to implement such arrangements. This cannot be done without the government's authority. In particular, this concerns those providing assistance from the West, who are trying to dispatch aid through neighboring Sudan.

There are greater hopes now following recent reports from Ethiopia that the northern rebels have responded favorably to calls from the international community, and that they are ready to help efforts to transport food. Recently it has become possible to send food aid across the battle lines, and in several areas peace appears to be returning. Furthermore, there are indications that the two warring sides do not rule out the possibility of resuming talks. This was said recently by former U.S. President James Carter, a mediator who initiated talks between Addis Ababa and its opponents.

There is a Soviet saying, that it is better to have a poor peace than to fight. Since war is threatening the lives of millions of people suffering from famine, there is no better option than peace.

Legislators Issue Communique on Mozambican Visit

MB1103121990 Moscow in English to Southern Africa 1900 GMT 7 Mar 90

[Text] Soviet and Mozambique MPs believe there can be no peace or stability in the south of the African Continent unless apartheid in South Africa is abolished.

They restated their country's support of the ANC [African National Congress] and other democratic forces in South Africa fighting to dismantle the system.

As a joint communique on the visit of a group of Soviet MPs to Mozambique notes, Pretoria has made an important step in the right direction by releasing Nelson Mandela and legalizing the ANC and a number of other democratic organizations in the country. Yet, as long as apartheid exists, sanctions against the South African regime must be preserved.

MPs stated with satisfaction the dynamic development of friendship between the Soviet Union and Mozambique and called for closer bilateral cooperation.

Somalia's Desire for Peace Talks Hailed

EA1603220890 Moscow International Service in Somali 1600 GMT 15 Mar 90

[Text] The government of Somalia is ready to hold unconditional peace talks with the opposition anywhere and at anytime. This was announced at a news conference in Mogadishu by Ahmed Jama Jangali, the foreign minister of Somalia. Our commentator Aleksandr Mikhaylov, comments on this:

He says the call by the head of the Somali Foreign Ministry is naturally intended for those outside the country. The call is especially intended for the representatives of organizations and agencies that defend human rights, journalists, and all other interested parties whom the Somali Government has invited to visit the country and see for themselves the current human rights situation. No doubt this call is also meant to act as a signal to those quarters who aid Somalia that the violation of human rights is a thing of the past that will not be repeated.

As everyone knows, the suppression of the residents in Mogadishu, in which a lot of blood was shed in the riots in July, resulted in a great reduction in aid by donors, which brought the Somali economy to collapse. I think, said our commentator, that introducing the economy to free market principles is aimed at winning new sources of financing. Many issues stand as we have discussed, but those who believe the current reforms in process in Somalia were brought about by outside pressure can even point to other reasons. However, I think, said our commentator, that the most important fact is that these changes are continuing. The leadership of Somalia has finally realized that the former style of leading the country was not applicable in the new circumstances.

The committee formed last year quickly got to work in preparing the new constitution. Its work will soon be tabled in the People's Assembly after being approved by the Somali Revolutionary Socialist Party. This party has acknowledged the need for introducing a multiparty system in the country. Many issues are still connected with the leadership of the sole party.

The leadership is full of those who believe that the changes have been made only because there is no alternative and who wish to return to the former system. However, there are also in the party leadership those who follow a reasonable policy and believe that these changes are the only way to save the country and the party.

Similarly, the rebels opposing the government are not all alike. Some of the opposition politicians are actively participating in the current changes and are preparing for those still to come. However, all the opposition forces engaged in armed struggle failed to respond to the government's call. I can accept, said our commentator, that the ruling regime of Somalia under the leadership of Mohamed Siad Barre appears to them as ugly and not worthy of negotiations, but the question is, he added, is it right to play blind and deaf, including seizing power through peace and not force to achieve your goal?

Ahmed Jama Jangali said that the top priority of the government is to bring peace and stability to the country. I am fully confident, concludes our commentator, that this aim brings honor to any government irrespective of the organization or the party that leads it.

Polisario Front Says Ready For New Truce

LD2202110590 Algiers Domestic Service in French 0600 GMT 22 Feb 90

[Text] On the eve of the trip by the UN representative to North Africa, the Polisario Front has announced in Algiers that it is ready to observe a new military truce. This is not the first time. Just a year ago the Polisario Front observed a first military truce lasting one month, which was decided after the meeting in Marrakech between the king of Morocco and a Saharan delegation.

East Europe

Bulgarian Premier Andrey Lukanov Visits Moscow

Pre-Visit Interview Reported

PM2003100990 Moscow RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA in Russian 18 Mar 90 p 3

[Interview with Andrey Lukanov, chairman of the Bulgarian Council of Ministers, by Aleksey Nikitushkin in Sofia under the rubric: "The Planet: People, Events, Facts": "Bulgaria-USSR: Cooperation Is the Main Reference Point"; date of interview not stated]

[Text] [Nikitushkin] Comrade Lukanov, what is the aim of your upcoming visit to the USSR?

[Lukanov] I would like to stress that even now, in a time of profound changes in our countries and in the system of cooperation, we give paramount attention to our close contacts with the Soviet Union, which have a long history. For us, these contacts have an extremely important political and practical significance. As leader of the Bulgarian Government, I am fully aware of the fact that the tasks facing our economy can only be successfully resolved if there are a number of necessary preconditions of both an internal and an international nature. One of these is undoubtedly Bulgarian-Soviet cooperation, on which a great deal in our national economy depends.

Therefore, during my visit to Moscow, I intend to discuss with my Soviet colleagues ways of preventing an abatement in our economic relations in the face of

radical economic reforms being carried out in our countries and a transition to new principles of cooperation based on market criteria.

Obviously, we must not just preserve what is most valuable in what we have achieved—specialization and organic cooperation between our economies—but also jointly seek reserves and sources of further development in our ties. We realize clearly that cooperation with the USSR will carry on having decisive significance for our country in the future.

Naturally, Bulgaria will develop ties with other countries, including some that are not in CEMA. In our view, such a policy is in line with the new trends in international development, particularly European development. But I would like to stress that we want the Soviet Union to carry on being our number one partner. I think that this is in both countries' interests.

[Nikitushkin] How do you assess the current state of Soviet-Bulgarian ties in the sphere of economic, scientific, and technical cooperation?

[Lukanov] I will say right away that I personally believe that it is satisfactory. At the same time, it must be noted that our ties in these spheres are experiencing profound, though ambiguous changes. A particular positive trend is the development of direct ties between Soviet and Bulgarian enterprises and firms, which is a result of the direct influence of higher departments and organizations (and in my view, this should gladden us). But at the same time, we are witnesses of certain phenomena which I would not call negative, but which create certain difficulties. For example, enterprises and associations that have received great independence, both in Bulgaria and in the USSR, assess in different ways a number of high-level decisions adopted, and they do not always take into consideration the logic and arguments which led to their signing. And as a result, they often doubt the necessity of actually carrying out duties resulting from these agreements—which, as a rule, both sides include in plans for their countries' economic development.

Furthermore, today we are unfortunately thinking less about long-term aims, including scientific, technical, and technological development, and interest is waning precisely in the long-term aspect, which at times is undermined by the partners' transient advantages and interests. This is probably explicable, since perestroyka in enterprises and associations is connected with the solution of serious everyday tasks and is inspired by the need to adapt efficiently to the current situation. But this should cause us some concern, because in this way less work will be done with the future in view.

[Nikitushkin] Of late we have been speaking increasingly often about both objective and subjective factors that impede mutually beneficial commodity exchange. What, in your opinion, are the reasons for this?

[Lukanov] Indeed, there is a trend toward suppressing the growth in our commodity exchange to a certain degree and, in the past few months, even reducing it by a certain amount. Objective factors— primarily in our countries' material and technical provision—and a change in the consumer structure to the advantage of internal markets are, to a great extent, the reason for this.

But there are subjective factors too, and I would say that deterioration in the level of discipline is one of the main ones. It is discipline that lies at the heart of any business, any economy, and particularly a market economy. Nowadays the old instruments for maintaining it no longer work—I have in mind the administrative-edict style of leadership—while, at the same time, no new complex of legislative, economic, currency and financial instruments has yet been created to guarantee that mutual obligations are unconditionally fulfilled, and this was bound to have an effect on our commodity exchange. Nor must we ignore the fact that money is "working" extremely inefficiently at present—not just as a means of effecting payments, but also as a disciplinary, stimulating factor. All this requires that the transfer to a new system of payment relations be speeded up—a subject, incidentally, that was discussed at the 45th CEMA Session Sitting in Sofia. And I believe that this subject will be a central one during our talks with the Soviet leadership.

An abrupt transfer to payment in freely convertible currency is not the best option, in my opinion, because it could lead to a considerable fall in the level of commodity exchange and complications in the stable development of economic ties. But that method, with an obligatory transitional period, is vital for us. Only then will enterprises and associations feel the radical changes that will stimulate more productive and higher-quality labor and extend trade and economic ties with other countries. Therefore we believe that we must transfer to new forms of payment, which may be either in a multicurrency form, that is, carried out as in clearing account units, or in convertible and national currencies, with imbalances that arise urgently eliminated and prices brought into line with international prices.

All this gives me grounds for thinking that we will be able to adopt both short-term and medium-term decisions, A. Lukanov said in conclusion, which will be in the interests of our countries and peoples and will return to Bulgarian-Soviet economic cooperation the dynamics and vitality to which we have become accustomed.

Gorbachev Receives Lukanov

LD1903200390 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1800 GMT 19 Mar 90

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] Andrey Lukanov, chairman of the Bulgarian Council of Ministers, has been on a working visit to Moscow at the invitation of the Soviet leadership. Today he was received by Comrade Gorbachev. Before the start of the conversation, Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev said this to journalists:

[Begin recording] [Gorbachev] I assess those processes that are taking place in the USSR and in other countries of East Europe as changes of an altogether immense nature and as having immense significance not only for the destinies of our people, for our countries, but also for Europe and the whole world. After all the USSR and the countries of East Europe are an immense area, and what is happening in this region is already having an effect on the whole world situation. Thus, it is perhaps now that the destinies both of these peoples and countries, and of Europe and the world, are being decided. It seems to me that in principle, despite all the difficulties and contradictions of the processes that are taking place; despite all the anxiety, despite all the concerns which accompany (?these things), well, (?how can it be otherwise)?

[Unidentified correspondent] It cannot be otherwise.

[Gorbachev] Indeed, such turnarounds do not take place easily or painlessly. Despite all that, I think that the USSR, Bulgaria, and other peoples are capable of all this, although a great deal of work will have to be done so that the goals that we have set within the framework of the renewal of our countries can be achieved. [end recording] [video shows Gorbachev shaking hands with Lukanov; Gorbachev shown addressing journalists]

The exchange of opinions touched on the major transformations in the state and social life of the USSR and Bulgaria, the prospects for Soviet-Bulgarian relations, and the situation in Europe.

It is very important, stated the USSR president, to maintain the old and good tradition of cooperation, but it is even more important to raise it to the level of the requirements of the times. Both sides confirmed that strategic policy of enriching the equal and mutually advantageous economic and scientific-technical ties. This will be promoted by the planned transition to accounting in freely convertible currency using world prices.

Discussing the state of affairs in Europe, Comrades Gorbachev and Lukanov noted that further development of the profound positive changes that have begun here are currently undergoing a grave test that is primarily connected with the implementation of the rights of Germans in the GDR and FRG to self-deterination. Their unification can take place without detriment to the other European states and to lasting peace and cooperation in the continent only along an all-European course and under conditions where a system of European security is created. This must rule out a one-sided [odnostoronnyy] bloc orientation and must end in a peaceful settlement. In this context the importance of respecting the postwar borders existing in Europe was particularly stressed.

The conversation took place in an atmosphere of friendship and mutual understanding.

Gorbachev-Lukanov Talks Detailed

PM2003114390 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian Second Edition 20 Mar 90 p 1

[TASS report: "Talks in the Kremlin"]

[Text] On 19 March M.S. Gorbachev received A. Lukanov, chairman of the Bulgarian Council of Ministers and member of the Bulgarian Communist Party Supreme Council Presidium, who was paying a brief working visit to the Soviet Union.

Lukanov congratulated Gorbachev on his election to the post of president of the USSR which met with a broad and sincere positive response among the Bulgarian public.

An exchange of opinions concerned major transformations of state and public life in the Soviet Union and Bulgaria, prospects of Soviet-Bulgarian relations and the situation in Europe.

They stated the close proximity of the two countries' approaches to the key problems of renewal and humanization of society, which obviously presupposes taking adequately into account each country's unique history and specific present conditions. On this basis favorable opportunities are now being opened up for attaining a new quality in the development of friendly Soviet-Bulgarian relations.

It is very important, the Soviet president said, to preserve long-standing good traditions of cooperation, but it is still more important to take this cooperation to the level of modern requirements, the present dynamics of world changes.

Both sides reconfirmed their strategy aimed at enriching equitable and mutually beneficial economic, scientific and technical relations. This will be facilitated by the planned progressive transition to settling accounts in freely convertible currency using world prices.

Lukanov told Gorbachev about the democratization of Bulgarian society and the emerging multi-party system in his country. Under these conditions, the Bulgarian Government is seeking to ensure national consensus and legality, which are needed for a peaceful transition from the administrative-command system towards a modern state structure. The ruling party, having renounced its monopoly on power, has embarked on the path of renewal and advancement towards democratic socialism and a law-governed state. It will strive for the vanguard position in honest competition and cooperation with all other political and public forces acting within the framework of the Constitution.

Discussing the situation in Europe, Gorbachev and Lukanov noted that the development of deep positive changes, which have begun here, is now undergoing serious trials, relating above all to the realization of the right of Germans in the German Democratic Republic

and West Germany to self-determination. Their unification can proceed without detriment for other European states, for the sake of durable peace and cooperation on the continent, only as part of the total European process, under conditions of forging a system of European security. It must rule out one-sided bloc orientation and end in a peaceful settlement.

The preservation and consolidation of stability and trust in Europe calls for the highest sense of responsibility and constructive efforts on the part of all member-states of the European process and the strict adherence of each and every state to their international commitments. In his connection the sides especially stressed the importance of respecting the inviolability of existing postwar borders in Europe.

The conversation was held in an atmosphere of friendship and mutual understanding.

Lukanov Comments on Talks

LD1903201690 Moscow TASS in English 2001 GMT 19 Mar 90

[Text] Moscow March 19 TASS—Bulgarian Prime Minister Andrey Lukanov has said that the atmosphere of his conversations with President Mikhail Gorbachev and Prime Minister Nikolay Ryzhkov "accorded with the character of relations" between the two countries and "fully justified his expectations".

"The meetings were sincere, friendly and frank," the Bulgarian prime minister said in an interview with TASS diplomatic correspondents before his flight from Moscow. He stayed in the Soviet Union on a one-day working visit at the invitation of the Soviet leadership.

"Notwithstanding profound social, political and economic changes in the two countries, Soviet-Bulgarian relations are characterised by profound content, firm foundation and great stability," Lukanov noted.

"Our relations are getting a new wind and new possibilities for development," he stressed.

"Relations between our countries are certainly changing and will continue to change. Nostalgia is out of place here. We cannot cling to what we relied on in the past. Neither can we abide by some formal postulates," Lukanov said.

"It is necessary to create a new system of interaction, especially in economy," Lukanov believes. "It should proceed from realities of the contemporary world and world economy, from the realities of Soviet and Bulgarian economies."

"Such a system should be based on new market economy principles and ensure complete mutual advantage and efficiency of bilateral relations. With all its distinction, it should increasingly look like normal relations between normal economies in normal market conditions," the Bulgarian prime minister said.

Further on Lukanov Comments

LD2003121690 Moscow TASS in English 1132 GMT 20 Mar 90

[Text] Moscow March 20 TASS—"The spirit and atmosphere of the talks with Soviet leaders held during my visit to Moscow have met all expectations. These meetings were very sincere, friendly and utterly candid," Bulgarian Prime Minister and Member of the Presidium of the Bulgarian Communist Party Supreme Council Andrei Lukanov told TASS upon the completion of his one-day working visit to the USSR.

"Despite changes in social and political life and in the two countries' economies, Soviet-Bulgarian ties run deep and are very stable," Lukanov stressed. At the same time, he pointed to the need to create a new system of interaction, above all, in the economic sphere.

In Lukanov's view, this system should proceed from the realities of the modern world, be based on the new principles of the market economy, and make sure that bilateral ties are mutually advantageous and promising.

Touching on the question of German re-unification, Lukanov said: "Certainly, Germans have the right to unification. The European context is the best for a solution to these issues, which is beneficial not only for Germans," he added.

"It is very important here to abide by the principle of the inviolability of the borders, which had been drawn after the Second World War, and respect the rights of states which bore the brunt of the war against Hitlerism."

Lukanov supported Mikhail Gorbachev's idea of building a common European home and noted that this initiative was becoming increasingly real. "The building of the European home has shifted from the design to the construction stage," he said.

"For this process to develop normally, each European state should respect the rights of all other states, their identity and the right to a choice," Lukanov stressed.

Ryzhkov Holds Talks With Lukanov

LD1903202390 Moscow TASS in English 2006 GMT 19 Mar 90

[Text] Moscow March 19 TASS—Soviet Prime Minister Nikolay Ryzhkov and his Bulgarian counterpart Andrey Lukanov today discussed a broad range of questions of Soviet-Bulgarian cooperation in new conditions, as well as topical international problems. Lukanov was staying in the Soviet Union on a working visit at the invitation of the Soviet leadership.

The sides agreed on specific ways and possibilities of overcoming difficulties that arose during the implementation by both states of their obligations for mutual

deliveries of goods. Special attention was given to problems of a transition to a new system of settling accounts with the use of freely convertible currency on the basis of world prices.

The sides expressed the striving vigorously to conduct radical restructuring of multilateral cooperation within the Council for Mutual Economic Assistance in the spirit of the decisions of the 45th Sofia session of the CEMA, bringing it closer to the conditions of the world market and deepening mutually advantageous ties with the European Community.

The negotiations confirmed a high degree of mutual understanding of the sides on questions discussed, the consistency of the course of the Soviet Union and Bulgaria at the deepening of friendly cooperation between the two countries and at upgrading their interaction on the international scene.

Further on Ryzhkov-Lukanov Talks

PM2003114190 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian Second Edition 20 Mar 90 p 6

[TASS report: "Soviet-Bulgarian Talks"]

[Text] Talks took place 19 March between Nikolay Ryzhkov, chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, and Andrey Lukanov, chairman of the Council of Ministers of the People's Republic of Bulgaria. The similarity of the problems which both governments have to resolve was noted. In the exchange of information on the political and socioeconomic situation in both countries, on the processes of reforms taking place in them, a wide range of questions of Soviet-Bulgarian cooperation in the new conditions was examined and topical problems of international life were discussed.

A. Lukanov reported on the activity of the Bulgarian Government in overcoming the difficulties it faces in the economy and in implementing economic reform in the country. He stressed that the Bulgarian leadership is in favor of a peaceful, stable transition to the new democratic structures, and to these ends is to open a constructive dialogue with all the country's sociopolitical forces. The chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers reported on the present stage of transformations in the country, the work of the extraordinary third congress of USSR People's Deputies, the significance of its decisions for strengthening the system of state management and the development of socialist democracy, the implementation of the government's program for improving the economy of the Soviet Union, the implementation of the economic reform, and the fundamental approaches to the development of the 13th five-year- plan period.

Both leaders stated that the Soviet Union and Bulgaria highly evaluate the long traditions of fraternal friendship between the peoples of both countries, and intend to consistently develop and renew Soviet-Bulgarian relations. They stressed that the democratic transformations being implemented in the USSR and the People's Republic of Bulgaria are creating favorable opportunities for raising the efficiency of bilateral cooperation in all spheres, and for the restructuring of economic links between both countries on the basis of the sensible combination of the planned and the market principles. At the same time, the transition of enterprises carrying out foreign economic activity to the principles of financial autonomy raises their demands on each other, especially where the quality and the technical level of reciprocal deliveries and their competitiveness and other conditions of trade are concerned. Mutual understanding was attained regarding the concrete ways and possibilities for overcoming the difficulties arising in the course of the execution by the two sides of their commitments for mutual goods deliveries. Particular attention was given to the examination of the problems of the transition to a new system of payments with the application of freely convertible hard currency on the basis of world prices. The joint desire was expressed to actively carry out a fundamental restructuring of the mechanism of multilateral cooperation within the framework of the CEMA in the spirit of the decisions of the 45th CEMA session in Sofia, drawing it nearer to the conditions of the world market, and to deepen the mutually useful links with the EC.

The talks affirmed the high degree of mutual understanding of the two sides on the questions discussed, the consistency of the course of the USSR and the People's Republic of Bulgaria for deepening friendly cooperation between both countries and the development of interaction on the international arena.

Taking part in the talks on the Soviet side were: Yu.D. Maslyukov, first deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers and chairman of the USSR State Planning Committee, V.K. Gusev, deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, S.V. Kolpakov and N.A. Pugin, USSR ministers, and V.V. Sharapov, ambassador of the USSR to the People's Republic of Bulgaria; on the Bulgarian side: B. Belchev, deputy chairman of the Council of Ministers and finance minister, P. Bashikarov, K. Stanilov and I. Tenev, ministers, and G. Pankov, Bulgaria's ambassador to the USSR.

Lukanov Leaves Moscow

LD1903203490 Moscow TASS in English 1921 GMT 19 Mar 90

[Text] Moscow March 19 TASS—Bulgarian Prime Minister Andrey Lukanov, left Moscow today upon completion of his working visit to the Soviet Union at the invitation of the Soviet leadership.

Lukanov was seen off by Nikolay Ryzhkov and other officials at the airport which was decorated with Bulgarian and Soviet national flags.

Figures for Soviet-Bulgarian Trade Cited

PM1603144990 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 16 Mar 90 Second Edition p 7

[Own correspondent L. Zhmyrev dispatch under the general heading "How We Trade": "USSR-Bulgaria: There Is No Cause for Optimism"]

[Text] Sofia—V. Dyakov, the USSR's trade representative in Bulgaria, describes the state of and prospects for Soviet-Bulgarian trade and economic cooperation as follows:

Last year mutual trade turnover between the USSR and Bulgaria reached 12.6 billion rubles [R]. Of this, Soviet deliveries and Bulgarian exports totaled R5.8 billion and R6.8 billion, respectively.

Why do Bulgarian deliveries exceed those from the USSR by approximately R1 billion? The point is that the Bulgarian side is still paying off debts and credits which it received from the Soviet side over the last few years. In 1989 Bulgaria paid off debts to the USSR of R421 million, and this year it plans to clear R374 million. Bulgaria also intends to clear the remaining R110 million this year.

USSR-Bulgarian trade and economic relations do, of course, have their difficulties and problems. Take, say, the fall in world oil prices. For this reason alone during the current five-year plan the Soviet side has lost approximately R2.5 billion in its reciprocal transactions with Bulgaria. After all, we supply the fraternal country with 11.5 million tonnes of oil and 6.8 cubic meters of gas every year.

As for the Bulgarian side, last year it failed to supply the USSR with food and consumer goods worth approximately R1.7 billion. Thus the planned volumes of canned fruit and vegetables, tobacco, fresh apples, pepper, tomatoes, and sewn, knitted, and fur goods were not dispatched to the USSR.

All this explains why the volume of reciprocal commodity turnover this year is scheduled to be significantly lower than last year—approximately R11 billion. It remains to add that the USSR's debt in its trade and economic ties with Bulgaria will total approximately R500 million by the beginning of next year.

Falin Expresses Support for German Peace Treaty

LD1603212890 East Berlin ADN International Service in German 2045 GMT 16 Mar 90

[Text] Berlin (ADN)—Valentin Falin, head of the International Relations Department of the CPSU Central Committee and one of the closest advisors of Mikhail Gorbachev, has spoken out in favor of concluding a German peace treaty. In an exclusive article for the GDR weekly "DAS BLATT," excerpts of which were prereleased to ADN on Friday, Falin writes: "Any attempt to destroy or ignore the objective connection between German unification and the pan-European process threatens to break up the incipient or developing positive processes in Europe. The USSR cannot permit that."

Valentin Falin asks that World War II be considered finished, and that the state of legal uncertainty be ended. "For the new stage of postwar development, a peaceful European future, an exact legal basis must be created. Hence it is necessary to conclude a German peace treaty. Certain values and principles, above all those which concern the inviolability of frontiers, should be enshrined in it. That is a vital question both for Poland and the Soviet Union, both for Czechoslovakia and for Germany's neighbors in the West, North, and South."

TASS Observer Analyzes GDR Election Results

LD1903234590 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1412 GMT 19 Mar 90

["On the Results of the GDR Elections"—TASS political observer Albert Balebanov]

[Text] [No dateline as received]—The first free elections in the GDR took place yesterday. The first thing which strikes one upon studying their results is the fantastic level for the country of participation in elections by the electorate—93.2 per cent. Such significant activity by the electorate, in my view, is explained by the aspiration of the GDR citizens toward the unification of the two German states, toward democracy and palpable socioeconomic progress. I will note immediately that the election results have proved to be far from those which public opinion polls, that have been conducted regularly over the last three months, predicted. According to those polls, the Social Democrats should have won the elections and the Party for Democratic Socialism [PDS] should not have gathered more than 10-15 percent of the votes. That planned outcome was essentially refuted by the 30 percent of those polled who did not express their final attitude then to any of the 24 parties which participated in the elections.

The success of the Christian Democratic Union [CDU], which managed to amass the greatest number of votes—over 40 percent—was convincing. Immediately the question arises: Why? It is difficult to answer this question definitively, but nevertheless it seems that a whole number of factors played their role. The first and perhaps the main one of them consists in the tactics which were chosen at these elections by... FRG Chancellor Helmut Kohl. He conducted an election campaign under a slogan, the sense of which could be formulated in the following way: If the voters give their preference to the CDU, then the FRG will afford the country generous economic assistance, and if not, then there will be no money. The emphasis on the material side, taking into account the GDR's economic difficulties, has worked, according to all indications. Evidently, the Protestant Church, which, acting openly and behind the scenes,

managed to gather the needed support for the political force related to it, played a definitive role in the victory.

Here it would be appropriate to mention also the commonly known fact of the open interference of FRG political forces in the battle for the outcome of the elections in the GDR. And the West German Social Democrats even played into the hands of the chancellor with their policy. As a result, the Social Democratic Party [SPD] received just 22 percent of the vote. And this is one of the reasons for its defeat. There is also a more profound reason: Latent competition with the PDS. After all, there was essentialy in the SPD position much of what the PDS advocated. As a result, there is a minimal gap from the PDS: Only about 5 percent.

The PDS, within the framework of its possibilities and against the background of the anti-Communist campaign which has been unfolded in the country, achieved more than was predicted. This is a definite plus for it. It means that the Party is alive and is reviving. And, importantly, largely due to young people. The PDS has also undertaken apt tactical steps. It is noteworthy that the PDS took over 30 percent of the vote in Berlin. The conservative forces had the upperhand in the south of the country.

The elections showed that division into two wings has taken place in the GDR population: On the one hand, for an independent path of development of the country, and on the other hand for early union with the FRG. This delimitation is clear to see, which proves just how excited the population is with the prospect of the fusion of the two German states. Once more the old truth has been confirmed, that any disorder in life, and political instability evoke the movement to the right. This essentially is what happened today in the GDR.

Today it is clear that the elections will provide an impetus for the process of German unification. It is important that this process should advance rationally, stage by stage, with consideration being taken of the interests of the four victorious powers, that it should be entered into the common European process and be synchronized with it. In this sense, particular responsibility falls upon the CDU following the election results. The party leaders should fully realize this.

East, West German Leaders View Poll Results

PM1903145990

[Editorial Report] London BBC Television Network in English carries at 2005 GMT on 18 March a BBC 2 "Newsnight" special presented by Donald MacCormick live from East Berlin entitled "Ballot in Berlin." In an Olenka Frankiel video report on the election results, the GDR CDU [Christian Democratic Union] candidate Lothar de Maiziere says in German with superimposed English translation: "I think one of the most important reasons for this result is that we have made it clear right from the beginning that we want a strong market economy with a social emphasis, and we want German unification as quickly as possible." Frankiel says: "And this was the message a few minutes ago from the real winner—Chancellor Kohl—the man across the border who pulled the strings." Chancellor Helmut Kohl, speaking German with superimposed English translation, tells the people: "My plea to you in this hour is to stay in your homes, in your villages and towns, to stay in your factories and to help us so that together we can build up this beautiful, wonderful country."

Following the video report, GDR Prime Minister Hans Modrow is interviewed by MacCormick. Modrow speaks in German with superimposed English translation. The following is a text of the recorded interview:

[MacCormick] Well, just a few minutes ago, I spoke to the East German Prime Minister Hans Modrow. I asked him how he explained the extent of his party's defeat tonight.

[Modrow] Ninety-eight percent wasn't just for one party: It was for all the parties around the country. There was an arrangement between them how many seats each should get. In this election there's a completely new situation: Now there are many different parties producing totally different results. The PDS [Party of Democratic Socialism] looks as though it will get 15 percent—that means it should be a strong opposition in parliament. But there are other parties that will be in the opposition, too: the Peasant Party or the Greens, for instance. It should be possible to have a consensus between these various opposition groups.

[MacCormick] In the campaign, Mr. Modrow, the center right alliance were pressing the hardest for an early move to a unified Germany. Now that the center right have won, when do you expect to see a united Germany?

[Modrow] You're touching on a problem that isn't just ours, the Germans in the East and the West. It's a question which affects not only our people but our neighbors, too: As the two German states grow together, the whole of Europe will have to share the responsibility.

[MacCormick] Are you personally disappointed no longer to be prime minister?

[Modrow] No, it's been clear for a long time that this period would be something purely transitional. That's not my problem: My problem is that I hope that the stability which we've managed to achieve over the past four months—despite all the difficulties—can be preserved.

The program continues with a live panel discussion in the studio, in which MacCormick asks Dr Ottfried Hennig, FRG deputy minister for inter-German relations: "Now how soon do you think the two Germanys are going to sweep on and become one country? Because the leader of the [FRG] Christian Democrats with whom... whom you represent here tonight, in Bonn during the campaign—playing a big part in the East German campaign—were pressing hard for unification

but more lately seemed to be sort of reining back slightly. How soon do you think it's going to come?"

Hennig answers: "Well, we were not pressing towards reunification, but the people in the GDR did it, and I think the decisive factor in these elections was that the CDU and her partners, the alliance, said: We want reunification now. The Social Democrats had other arguments but not this 'reunification now.' And this decided the elections, and I think it will happen now, but it is a matter of self-determination and that means that the Volkskammer [People's Chamber] and the new government of East Germany will give their vote, they will say what they want, and our advice is to make it via Article 23, and that means rather fast." "You mean," MacCormick asks, "that individual bits of East Germany can join onto West Germany?" Hennig says: "Individual or the whole, as such, yes."

Discussing comments that the East Germans believe that unification will bring them quick money, MacCormick asks Hennig, "Did money talk?" Hennig replies: "Not at all. I think people in East Germany know very well that state money will not reform the whole thing but only private money. And that they have to give the conditions free that private money can flow in—not only money from West Germany but also money from Western Europe, from all over the free world, and this has nothing to do with Helmut Kohl. [sentence as heard] His advice was 'reunification now,' and I think that was decisive: I can only repeat it."

Reporter Vivian White at the Palace of the Republic asks Volker Ruhe, introduced as FRG CDU general secretary: "Haven't you wound up the East Germans to expect instant and easy unity, and aren't you now risking paying the price?" Ruhe tells him: "It's quite extraordinary after such a success that you have such worries. I think what has won is the alternative to socialism. People didn't want just a variety of socialism: They wanted the real alternative—a social market policy in the spirit of Ludwig Erhard, and they also wanted to vote for a party which is seeking the unity of Germany on the basis of the present Constitution of the Federal Republic." White says: "Well, there's my point: If they're expecting another Ludwig Erhard, another economic miracle, they're not going to be satisfied, are they, for some time?" Ruhe replies: "Well, it's not an easy way, but we have proposed thezcurrency union, and we are ready to help them with the deutschemark over here and also with the social union: That is the only way to stop the flood and the exodus of refugees, by the way."

Returning to the panel discussion in the studio, MacCormick asks Hennig how soon the Germans will achieve unity. Hennig tells him: "This is, first of all, a question of self-determination: The East German parliament has to say now what it wants—what they want, what the government wants—and then we'll find a way to arrangezit with our Western partners in the alliance, with the Russians. Of course, we have to talk about the security structures; of course, we have to find a way for the Soviet troops to leave or to stay. For me, this is not the decisive point—part of them can stay: It doesn't make me anxieties." [as heard] MacCormick asks him whether the sheer cost will destabilize the whole operation. Hennig tells him: "Of course, it will cost something, but in the end, if you look at it after three or five years, I think it will be a very positive factor, and we all will win with that—the whole Europe will win with it. And we have an enormous market for the next 10 years to come, and so in the end I see only positive results after we have pushed it a little: That will cost taxpayers money, but in the end, it will be positive."

Poland's Jaruzelski Welcomes Gorbachev Election

PM2003112190 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
17 Mar 90 Second Edition p 4

[Undated message from Polish President W. Jaruzelski to M.S. Gorbachev on his election as USSR President]

[Text] To His Excellency, President of the USSR Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev.

Esteemed Mr President,

Dear Mikhail Sergeyevich,

On your election as president of the USSR by the Third Congress of USSR People's Deputies I would like to convey to you my cordial congratulations and best wishes.

I am convinced that your election to this eminent and, at the same time, extremely important post will meet with great support in Poland. We are following with special interest and sincere sympathy the process of the comprehensive restructuring political, public, and economic life in your country and the USSR's dynamic, peace-loving foreign policy. Polish society respects you deeply for your decisive personal contribution to the initiation and implementation of these transformations. It also considers them highly significant for the development of democratic reforms in Poland and other central and East European countries and also for the strengthening of peace and security and the creation of new structures for cooperation in Europe and the world.

I would like to take this opportunity of noting with a sense of personal satisfaction the joint achievements in building a new model of Polish-Soviet relations, based on a broad social foundation and real observance of the principles of equality, sovereignty, and noninterference in internal affairs. The reform process creates favorable prerequisites for strengthening all the values that unite us and, at the same time, for finally ridding our relations of the tragic accretions of the past that encrust them. Your election as USSR President will help to bring the two countries closer together and contribute to sincere, genuine friendship between the peoples of Poland and the Soviet Union.

The development of events in Europe reaffirms the importance and necessity of Polish-Soviet collaboration in the international arena. It acquires special significance in the process of the formation of our continent's new aspect and the creation of an effective security system based on a strategic balance of forces and on the provision of a peaceful life for the European peoples. We value highly the firm support given by the Soviet Union and by you personally, Mr President, to Poland's vitally important interests, including the inviolability of its frontiers.

I would like once again to cordially congratulate you and wish you, dear Mikhail Sergeyvich, new successes for the benefit of the Soviet Union and in the interests of peace and friendly cooperation between peoples, and also good health and general well-being.

With deep respect and a sense of personal friendship,

[Signed] Wojciech Jaruzelski, president of the Republic of Poland.

USSR-Polish Trade Turnover Protocol Reported

LD2003001190 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1636 GMT 19 Mar 90

[Text] Warsaw, 19 Mar (TASS)—For the first time in CEMA practice the accounts for certain goods exchanged between the Soviet Union and Poland will be conducted in dollars at current world prices. This is stipulated by a protocol on the trade turnover and payments between the two countries for 1990, that was signed today by K.F. Katushev, USSR minister of foreign economic relations, and M. Swiecicki, minister of foreign economic cooperation of Poland. Although the "dollar" proportion will amount to only 10 to 15 percent of the total trade turnover, both sides attach great significance to this as an experiment in perfecting new mechanisms for business cooperation.

A working meeting between S.A. Sitaryan, deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, and L. Balcerowicz, deputy chairman of the Council of Ministers of Poland, who are the chairmen of the national sections of the intergovernmental Soviet-Polish Commission for Economic, Scientific, and Technical Cooperation, also ended in Warsaw today. They examined the state and prospects of Soviet-Polish economic relations.

Before he flew from the Polish capital, S.A. Sitaryan said in a conversation with a TASS correspondent that in future the entire Soviet-Polish trade turnover will be calculated in convertible currencies, which will help to eliminate a certain tension that is now apparant in reciprocal trade. "No one will be able to say any longer that, as one sometimes hears today, one side profits from cooperation and another loses. The world market will be the judge. The new economic mechanism will make it necessary to think more about the quality of goods and about observing delivery times."

For his part, J. Ostynski, the minister who is head of Poland's Central Planning Department, noted that the current meeting will be useful since it has contributed to the quests for ways of solving problems of bilateral cooperation that, in his words, has a great future.

Raw Materials Loom Large in Trade With Poland

PM1603154190 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 16 Mar 90 Second Edition p 7

[Own correspondent A. Starukhin dispatch under the general heading "How We Trade": "USSR-Poland: Neighbors Have Always Traded"]

[Text] Warsaw—Our reciprocal commodity turnover has been around 13 billion rubles [R] a year for many years now. Poland is a significant partner for us and we are the Poles' largest trading partner.

What do we trade in? Overall, raw materials account for up to 75 percent of the commodities. For instance, under an existing agreement our country is to supply its Western neighbor with approximately 40 billion cubic meters of natural gas in 1991-1995. Poland is asking for these deliveries to be increased by approximately 11 billion cubic meters. We pump oil along other "pipelines" and electricity along thin copper wires.

Every time the trade organizers stress the following: All operations must not merely be beneficial to one of the partners but be solely mutually beneficial. Of course, we are also interested in maintaining the level of turnover that we have attained with Poland. Our country annually receives 11.5 million tonnes of large-size coal and approximately 5 million tonnes of coke, soda ash, and copper from across the Bug. Poland is the only CEMA country with which we can trade in raw materials. However, the raw material component only amounts to one-third of Poland's foreign trade turnover, unlike ours. We obtain outerwear and footwear, cosmetics, apples, potatoes, flowers, 26 specific components for "Zhigulis," and parts for aircraft and seagoing ships.

What do we take out of our pockets during mutual transactions? Unfortunately, primers and fountain pens. We calculate long and hard what goods and products can be offset against others and in what volumes. The weakness of our currencies and the fact that they are not convertible is the root of the evil.

We attempted to settle accounts using different, hard currency. The Poles were very pleased by this at first. Let me remind you of the television programs where clothes were displayed and it was noted how many extra dollars the country would procure for each one. Regrettably, practice rapidly and cruelly did away with this wave of euphoria. It transpired that raw materials are "convertible" everywhere and can be sold successfully at the other end of the earth. While it is very very difficult to sell outerwear, footwear, and potatoes given the tough

competition on the international market. We rapidly abandoned the novelty. But this question has not been put on ice for good.

So we are trading at present. As usual. They ask us for one thing, we ask for another in exchange.

West Europe

Col Gen Omelichev Pays Visit to Britain

LD1903115390 Moscow TASS in English 0857 GMT 19 Mar 90

[Text] London March 19 TASS—Colonel General Omelichev, deputy head of the General Staff of the Soviet Armed Forces, has arrived in Britain. The programme for his visit envisages a meeting with Tom King, British secretary of state for defence, and visits to military centres.

The London-based newspaper DAILY TELEGRAPH wrote today that the Defence Ministry regards this visit as another step in the development of a dialogue between British and Soviet Armed Forces.

Bonn Figures Talk Off the Record on Unification

PM1603145390 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 16 Mar 90 Second Edition p 6

[Dispatch by PRAVDA correspondent Ye. Grigoryev under the rubric "Topic of the Day: The German Question": "'Black Cat' on the Table, or What Is Being Said in Bonn's Corridors of Power"]

[Text] Bonn, March—When the so-called "black cat" appears on the table—in other words, the condition that the meeting is confidential is laid down—a journalist is put in a difficult position. He is allowed to speak of what he heard, but he must not reveal the name of his interlocutor or quote him directly. Well, I will hope that the reader will trust me.

Understandably, the German question was at the center of our attention. All thoughts and desires are now associated with it here. At the same time politicians in certain circles wish to create the impression that it is not they who are artificially accelerating the unification process: They say that the trends toward rapprochement have been caused by conditions beyond their control.

Not so long ago rapprochement between the GDR and the FRG was seen as taking place in stages. It found expression in the 10 points of the "Kohl Plan." Since the beginning of this year, however, circles close to the government have begun gradually to see the direct transfer of the FRG's economic, financial, and social conditions to the GDR as the way out of the situation.

The creation of a financial union—chiefly by introducing the West German currency in the GDR—is regarded as of paramount importance.

How do the powers that be in the FRG conceive the further course of things? They are campaigning, above all, for the creation of a coalition government in the GDR after the elections there. In this case, so they believe, the creation of a financial union could happen "very quickly." Bonn also proceeds from the premise that elections to local organs of power will take place during the summer and fall in the GDR, Laender will be created, and Land elections may be held. In other words, administrative structures analogous with the FRG's will emerge. Elections to the West German Bundestag will be held in December. And it may be possible to hold all-German elections next year.

In general, there is much that is contradictory in the views which many FRG politicians express. They give assurances that unification is, in their view, not only a German but also a European question.

Assurances are being given that there can be no question of any territorial demands by a future united Germany. Thus, it clearly follows from a resolution recently adopted by the ruling parties that this will in the future be recorded in a treaty with Poland. On the other hand, a refusal to resolve this question without delay, once and for all, so that the peoples are left with no fears or doubts, can be seen.

At the same time people in Bonn are eschewing a peace treaty with Germany designed to enshrine in international law, inter alia, recognition of the existing borders' inviolability. So it is said that, clearly, there will be no peace treaty. What influential West German circles have in mind instead is the "consecration" of external conditions for unification, including the question of the united Germany's borders, at the highest level at the CSCE.

In such conversations in Bonn you will be sure to hear many kind words addressed to the Soviet Union and its leader and wishes for success in perestroyka. A desire is expressed to develop cooperation with our country in every possible way. At the same time it is said that they understand and accept the Soviet Union's special security interests and that in this connection Soviet troops will undoubtedly remain on the territory of the present GDR even after Germany's unification "for a transitional period." But here, too, they speak of the united Germany's indispensable membership of NATO as a matter that has already been decided.

When you ask your interlocutor in this connection whether he is aware of the stand of the Soviet Union, which does not accept the united Germany's NATO membership, with a smile and even a certain hidden meaning he begins to assure you... of the reverse. He declares that such membership is all but in the interests of all of Europe.

At the same time people add that everything changes, including alliances, and new conditions and structures of all-European security will gradually arise in Europe as disarmament proceeds. For all that, they present the

united Germany's NATO membership as an initial axiom, do not accept other concepts, and do not yet wish to discuss them.

Latin America & Caribbean

Argentina's Menem Makes Statement on Gorbachev

LD2003101190 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0854 GMT 20 Mar 90

[Text] Buenos Aires, 20 Mar (TASS)—TASS correspondent Yevgeniy Alekseyev reports: Argentina is following the process of democratic changes in the Soviet Union with great attention, and is in favor of expanding and deepening mutually beneficial cooperation in all fields, President Carlos Menem of Argentina, said. He made this statement when presented with the text of a letter from M.S. Gorbachev in reply to a message previously sent to the latter by the Argentine side.

M.S. Gorbachev can be rightly considered the "politician of the century" for his huge contribution toward strengthening international security and ensuring the interests of all states of the globe, including the peoples of the developing countries, the Argentine president commented. C. Menem wished the Soviet leader success in his activities in the post of president of the USSR.

The text of the message presented to President C. Menem says that the Soviet side regards Argentina as an authoritative partner and highly values its activities in favor of peace.

Future Political Direction of Cuba Pondered

90UI0451A Moscow ARGUMENTY I FAKTY in Russian No. 11, 17-23 Mar 90 p 4

[Article by V. Borodayev, candidate of historical sciences, and G. Levykina, candidate of economic sciences: "Cuba: Difficult Path Toward Socialism"]

[Text] Cuba has for the past three decades invariably evoked interest in our country. Those who are over 40 will remember the sympathetic feelings which the USSR had toward the victory in 1959 of the people's revolution on Cuba. Today, reinterpreting our past, we are attempting to understand what kind of people our friends are and how relations with them are being built.

Complex and far from unambivalent processes have been taking place in Cuba of late. Extensive world comment has been elicited, for example, by the Cuban Government's measures pertaining to a purge of the ministries of the revolutionary armed forces and interior affairs of corrupt elements, and by two trials of generals and officers accused of complicity in narcotics trafficking.

The Western press sees these processes as the Cuban Government's suppression of political opponents. Articles are appearing which compare Cuba with North Korea and Albania, predicting for it a Romanian version of the development of events.

Speaking of the current political situation in Cuba, a number of factors need to be taken into consideration. It cannot be forgotten that the Cuban revolution is a young revolution. The scale of the external danger on the part of the United States needs to be borne in mind also. The United States still maintains the Guantanamo Naval Base on the country's territory. This forces the Cuban leadership to resort to extraordinary measures in defense of the country and is leading to the militarization of its social life. None of this could have failed to have made its mark on the process of the formation of the political system in Cuba and to have brought about to a large extent the current limitations of socialist democracy proclaimed by the 1976 Constitution.

Undoubtedly, each country has the right to its own formula for happiness. Cuba has always tried to avoid copying the development models of the other socialist states and has endeavored to seek its own solutions, not declining to make use of foreign experience here. Many of the changes which have occurred recently in the USSR and the East European countries, steps in the direction of political pluralism and a market economy particularly, have received far from the most rapturous reception in Cuba. In a number of his speeches, F. Castro, first secretary of the Cuban Communist Party Central Committee and chairman of the Council of State and the Council of Ministers, has emphatically rejected the possibility of the implementation of such reforms in Cuba. This position was underlined in the declaration "To the Cuban People" adopted unanimously on 25 December 1989 at a session of the National Assembly of the people's power. The ban on the distribution in the country of two Soviet publications—the weekly MOSKOVSKIYE NOVOSTI and the journal SPUTNIK—imposed by the Cuban authorities in August 1989 should be viewed in this context also.

Is There an Opposition in Cuba?

Far from everyone in Cuba agrees with the policy of its government. Going by Cuban press reports and the speeches of certain leaders, discontent in the country among some of its population is being manifested on the grounds of growing economic difficulties. There are supporters of reforms of the Soviet or East European type. It is no secret that many hundreds of thousands of Cubans have in the last three decades "voted with their feet" for capitalism, having emigrated to the United States.

A dissident movement whose activity is being covered extensively in the Western media began to take shape in the country at the end of the 1980's. Although it does not register informal organizations, neither does the Cuban Government persecute their members. Despite the

serious difficulties the country's leadership has experienced from time to time, it has never resorted to savage punishment of opponents or the use of the armed forces to put down disorders.

The situation in the Cuban economy remains complex. Crisis phenomena have been growing in the country since 1986. Not one sector of the economy fulfilled the plan quotas in 1989 (except for transport and sugar production).

Despite the system of the fixed distribution of basic foodstuffs and industrial commodities which has been in existence for three decades, the guaranteed provision of the population with basic necessities has not become a reality.

As a whole, the living standard of the population is declining. Unemployment has appeared. The numbers of unemployed have constituted 6 percent of those occupied in the state sector, and what is more, young people 30 years and under constitute more than half of them.

Debts and Aid

The deficit balance of Cuba's export-import transactions has now risen to 2 billion pesos. The main reason is the imbalance in its trade with the CEMA countries. As far as relations with the West are concerned, the Cuban Government's 50-percent reduction in imports for convertible currency has not alleviated the crisis. The republic's debt to countries with a market economy is in excess of $7 billion.

According to Western estimates, the annual amount of Soviet assistance to Cuba constitutes R5 billion. At the same time, however, the nonequivalent conditions of trade within the CEMA framework are costing the Soviet country $6-10 billion annually.

Cuba is granted assistance mainly via the mechanism of preferential prices, primarily for sugar. The fact that the USSR purchases Cuban sugar at such prices is not something unusual. Thus Great Britain purchases sugar from the English-speaking Caribbean countries at prices three times higher than the world price, and the United States, at double the world price. The Soviet price, on the other hand, is approximately three times higher than the world sugar price.

But the Cubans also frequently overpay for supplies of Soviet products. According to expert calculations, Soviet prices on machinery and engineering products for export are higher than average world prices.

Statements to the effect that this country has not achieved prosperity with the assistance of Soviet resources are somewhat of a speculative nature. Have we ourselves achieved this in more than 70 years? And are we not morally responsible for many mistakes and distortions in Cuba's economic policy whose ideas were suggested by our specialists?

'New Solutions of Old Problems'

Of course, it is hard living for decades in a "fortress under siege." Relying on international solidarity and the support of our country, the Cuban people have held out under these conditions. But an analysis of Cuba's development in recent years persuades us that the former methods of the leadership of the country's economic and social life are exhausted.

An attempt was made in Cuba at the end of the 1980's to overcome the difficulties by taking as a basis ideological and educational work and a strengthening of command principles in the leadership of the economy. However, this produced no pronounced results. As Cubans themselves today acknowledge, a search for "new solutions of old problems" is needed.

Supreme Soviet Session

Session To Discuss Issues on Security, Economy

LD2003060590 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0430 GMT 20 Mar 90

[Text] Today the deputies of the USSR Supreme Soviet will work in committees and commissions. As we have already reported, yesterday the session determined the priority trends in the law-making of the USSR Supreme Soviet in the immediate future. Life itself is bringing three groups of draft laws to the fore. First, it is a question of those related to interethnic relations, to the transition from a unitary state to a federation; second, there is a package of laws concerning the economy which will help in implementing the fundamental laws that have already been adopted in the socioeconomic sphere; and third, being dealt with are draft laws on issues of security and order in the country.

Supreme Soviet Session To Continue to Mid-May

LD1903182690 Moscow World Service in English 1600 GMT 19 Mar 90

[Text] At the resumed session of the Supreme Soviet today MPs have given priority to drafting a new Union Treaty and working out a mechanism for republics to secede from the union. Although a timetable for the session's work was not voted on, this proposal by the houses' chairmen evoked the speakers' support. The steering bodies have got down to debating the necessary drafts. They are also to examine a bill on liability for encroachment on national equality.

Next week the parliament is to consider some other top priority documents, including legislation on taxation and local self-management. A day has been reserved for the government to answer questions from MPs.

Since many important bills are being prepared, the start of the parliamentary recess will apparently be postponed from 25 April, as was earlier planned, to mid-May.

At the end of today's sitting the member of parliament Egidius Bickauskas from Lithuania informed the Supreme Soviet that the Lithuanian parliament had reaffirmed the irrevocability of its decisions to restore the independence of the Lithuanian state and had urged holding appropriate talks. He disclosed that he had been authorized to hand a letter on the matter to President Gorbachev.

Moscow TV Carries Supreme Soviet Session 19 Mar

Lukyanov Chairs Session

LD1903174790

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 1600 GMT on 19 March begins carrying a recording of the USSR Supreme Soviet joint chambers session held in the Kremlin in Moscow on 19 March. The session is chaired by Anatoliy Lukyanov. Lukyanov says 398 delegates are registered, and that there is a quorum. The joint session of chambers is declared open. Lukyanov says there must be discussion of the work of the Supreme Soviet following the congress, and there has to be an outline of the paramount issues for discussion and of procedures of the Supreme Soviet's work.

At 1604 GMT Primakov takes the floor. He speaks of the effect of the congress on the work of the Supreme Soviet. Primakov mentions the questions of Chernobyl and separate sessions of the chambers of the Supreme Soviet. He goes on to the monitoring of the implementation of laws adopted by the Supreme Soviet. Touching on discipline in the work of Supreme Soviet members, and on deputies ethics, he points out the impermissibility of crude comments regarding one's colleagues. He then goes on the organization of the parlianment's work, and the need to observe the standing orders to avoid wasting time. The renewal of the committees and commissions is also a major issue that has to be addressed, he notes. He says that conferences have to be held twice a month between the chairmen of the chambers and the heads of the committees.

At 1620 GMT questions are put to Primakov. A female deputy asks if there could be discussion at the beginning of the working year of the main draft laws that are to be adopted during the year. Primakov agrees there should be more system in the parliament's work. It is not however practical to envisage legislation over the course of the year, he notes.

at 1623 GMT Deputy Dzhanasbayev from Kazakhstan raises the question of the Semipalatinsk testing range.

At 1624 GMT Deputy Ponamarev raises the matter of television and newspaper coverage of the sessions. Primakov says there should be a decision on this to avoid people playing up to the cameras.

At 1626 GMT an unnamed deputy makes a proposal on the organization of the work of the parliament. Primakov replies.

At 1628 GMT an unnamed deputy raises the matter of deputies' work in their constituencies, noting the need to spend more time with local voters. Primakov says there has to be a quorum for the sessions, explains the procedure for deputies to leave for their constituencies.

At 1631 GMT a deputy asks for a date for the discussion of Chernobyl, and asks whether ministers will reply to questions on 28 March. Primakov says they will, but cannot give a date for the Chernobyl discussion.

At 1633 GMT a deputy asks how work in committees will be organized. Deputy Kugultinov says there should be a law protecting the honor of deputies, and proposes reducing television coverage.

At 1635 GMT a deputy proposes a law on culture and intellectual activity. Lukyanov suggests an end to questions, and suggests listening to Nishanov's report.

Nishanov on Secession Law

LD1903182490

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 1600 GMT on 19 March begins carrying a recording of the USSR Supreme Soviet joint chambers session held in the Kremlin in Moscow on 19 March. A deputy from the subcommittee on nuclear medicine raises the matter of Chernobyl, noting voters' requests for the closure of the Kursk Nuclear Electric Power Station. He also says the matter of public organizations and the party has to be examined. Lukyanov says nuclear power discussion will need time, although Chernobyl cannot be delayed.

At 1640 GMT a deputy raises the matter of the provision of information to deputies. Primakov agrees there has to be an adequate period of time in providing information to top deputies on agenda, etc., and goes on to explain how the provision of information in general will be improved.

At 1643 GMT Deputy Burlatskiy raises the matter of exit from the USSR and entry to the country, which was adopted at the first reading. He says the committees have refined the draft, and asks for speedy examination of the draft with a view to adopting it.

At 1644 GMT a deputy asks for foreign and internal affairs officials to give a report on the situation in the Baltic region. Primakov stresses the need to guarantee the interests of all strata of the population, and Lukyanov then adds information on Lithuania's decision on the status of deputies.

At 1647 GMT Nishanov, chairman of the soviet of nationalities takes the floor:

"A draft law has been prepared on secession of a Union republic from the Soviet Union. We will come back finally to the title of this draft law during the discussion, but, for the moment, it has been given the general title "On the mechanism for examining the secession of a Union republic from the USSR." There are here a number of provisions which deal with the legal and juridical aspects, a number of provisions dealing with the economic aspects and the humanitarian aspects, the period that the examination of such a question could take, and so on. But these are also of a preliminary nature, the proposals that have been set out, and these proposals have been examined in the commission on nationalities policy. During the initial discussion we intend to exchange opinions on this issue more broadly, and then we will submit to the Supreme Soviet a final draft law. This question is not, of course, a simple one; it is complex, and requires, of course, serious thought, and we are inviting members of the Supreme Soviet, both from the Soviet of Nationalities and from the Soviet of the Union, to take an active part in the drafting of this very complex document. A report on this issue is to be delivered at the session of the Soviet of Nationalities by Comrade Tarazevich, chairman of the Commission on Nationalities Policy and Interethnic Relations.

"Of course, at the moment, in the course of the processes of perestroyka, the growth of national awareness is proceeding rapidly, and I would say that this is a natural process, but at the same time, this process is also sometimes accompanied by separatist tendencies, by ultimatum-type demands, and so on. But since the question is a very serious one, I would request that it be looked at seriously, without giving way to emotion, since the matter concerns on the one hand, truly, the free expression of will about being part of the Soviet Union; but if the people, the population of any republic, tackle the question in another way, then this too must be examined sensibly, taking into account both the interests of the particular nation, the particular people, and also the interests of all the peoples of the Soviet Union. Of course, on the one hand, the well known folk saying, "You can't force someone to be nice," has to operate, but at the same time, the matter does not concern some kind of family quarrel. It would not be right, either, to simply say: Our love was without joy, so let's part without sorrow. We must examine these questions very seriously and profoundly."

Various Topics Mentioned

LD1903184290

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 1718 GMT resumes its recording of the USSR Supreme Soviet joint chambers session held in the Kremlin on 19 March. Deputy Bojars says that live relays distract women from housework, but highlights should be broadcast.

At 1720 GMT Deputy Skvortsov says that deputies should know the opinion of the local soviets. He asks if there are plans to discuss a draft law on referendums. Nishanov says that many are expressing a desire for such a draft law.

At 1722 GMT Deputy Obolenskiy says that television is an important source of information on events at the Supreme Soviet. Nishanov says that deputies will decide this matter.

At 1723 GMT Deputy Prokushev asks about ethnic Germans, and whether this issue will be examined. Nishanov says that this issue is constantly being monitored, and a commission led by Gusev is due to examine the issue of ethnic Germans.

At 1725 GMT a deputy asks whether state enterprises will come up for discussion. Nishanov says that it will. Deputy Saunin asks whether draft laws will be presented for the examination of Union Republic Supreme Soviets before they come up for a second reading. Nishanov notes the importance of the opinion of the republics.

At 1727 GMT Deputy Ryzhov raises a point concerning deputy absenteeism. Nishanov develops the point, saying that this issue is under examination.

At 1729 GMT Deputy Peters proposes raising the issue of secession and restoration of statehood. Nishanov says that this proposal will be examined in due course.

At 1730 GMT Deputy Tsyplayev complains about the time wasted on procedural matters. Nishanov agrees.

At 1731 GMT an unidentified deputy says that reportages from the Supreme Soviet should be broadcast for 1 hour per chamber on the first television channel.

At 1733 GMT Deputy Safarov asks whether there are plans to nominate a new head of the Committee on Socioeconomic matters, because Vilkas has resigned. Nishanov says that this matter is being looked into.

At 1734 GMT Deputy Boldyrev asks a question concerning monitoring the activity of the procurator's office. Boldyrev goes on to talk about the need for independent sources of information about the Supreme Soviet relays until the new Law on the Press is passed. Nishanov says that these are different issues, and the press would work to ensure that there is no subjectivism in reporting the Supreme Soviet debates.

At 1737 GMT Telegin calls for a strict schedule for debates, so that experts who are invited to participate in sittings know when they are needed. Nishanov says that this is desirable, but impossible.

At 1740 GMT Deputy Tsarevskiy asks about pension and leave provisions. Nishanov says that those laws must be passed at this session. Deputy Engver asks about television relays and press coverage. He goes on to ask about the interests of Muslims and notes favorable local press reviews of Usmanov's work.

At 1744 GMT Deputy Semenikhin asks about ethnic Germans' rights. Nishanov says that this issue should be discussed at local level first, and that people should be patient. Semenikhin asks that the issue of children's illnesses in the Semipalatinsk area should be discussed. Nishanov says that it will be debated.

At 1746 GMT Deputy Mironova asks for a mechanism to be developed to enable trade union officials to be more involved in the work of the Supreme Soviet. Nishanov agrees with this.

At 1747 GMT Deputy Tsybukh asks if draft laws could be examined at an earlier stage in the committees and commissions. Nishanov supports the idea of commissions and committees providing legislative initiative.

At 1750 GMT Deputy Guliy asks if all that has been promised will actually be discussed. Nishanov says that indeed all will be debated. Guliy asks when the laws on the press and on public organizations will be passed. Nishanov says that this session will decide on these laws.

At 1752 GMT Deputy Gamzatov returns to the issue of deputies having time with constituents.

'Pension' Law Touched On

LD1903190390

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Russian at 1753 GMT continues carrying its recording of the USSR Supreme Soviet joint chambers session held in the Kremlin on 19 March. Nishanov says that deputies are to be given opportunities to consult with their constituents. Gamzatov says that many questions are being asked about the draft law on conscience. Nishanov says that this draft law is now at the committee and commission stage.

At 1754 GMT an unidentified deputy says that it is wrong to end debates abruptly under a pretext that some deputies like to see themselves on television. Lukyanov says that this issue is topical.

At 1756 GMT an unidentified deputy says that culture must be raised as a matter of urgency. another deputy asks about control over the work of the Procuracy. He also asks whether the bill on fighting AIDS is going to be discussed.

At 1758 GMT Pupkevich suggests a temporary break in relays of sessions. Another deputy asserts the futility of such questions and answers sessions. Lukyanov says that the session is proceeding correctly, according to procedure.

At 1800 GMT an unidentified deputy suggests that members of the Procuracy take part in receiving the electorate to deal with inquiries. Nishanov says this would be useful. The deputy then asks about rotation of deputies in the Supreme Soviet, and what deputies will do if released.

At 1803 GMT Lukyanov announces a 30-minute break. Lukyanov moves the session on to debates, and suggests the 3-minute rule for speeches.

At 1804 GMT Kucherenko says it is difficult to put across proposals in such a short period of time. He asserts the need for a clear-cut schedule. He says that his Planning, Budget and Finance Commission is ready to discuss the set of laws on taxation. He suggests that the session coordinate with the government on this matter to avoid confusion and delays. He says that it is better and more convenient to work three days in session and then two days in committees and commissions, rather than jumping about from one thing to another.

At 1810 GMT Gritsenko agrees with the earlier suggestion of a discussion of pensions being included, as also annual leave. On the decision under discussion, he proposes that a group be set up for planning and coordinating work schedules. He says there should be analysis of objective reasons for problems with the implementation of laws. He asserts the need to hear the views of experts, and suggests their should be an information stand showing schedules.

At 1818 GMT Deputy Bosenko asks about about the law on pensions, as it affects so many people. He proposes that the draft resolution on organization of Supreme Soviet's work place this law high on its list of priorities. Referring to criticisms of the poor organization of work of commissions and committees, he says that the conditions in which the latter work and the shortages they experience threaten the quality of the activity carried out. There is an urgent need for computerization, he says, and proposes that the Presidium examine the organization of work.

At 1824 GMT Miroshin says there is a need for a body to examine the relationship between the president and Supreme Soviet, and that the commissions and committees should look at matters relating to this.

At 1827 GMT Romanenko believes there should be presidential decrees on putting laws into effect. On coverage of the Supreme Soviet, he suggests greater coverage by IZVESTIYA. He also makes proposals on the procedure of work. On relaying sessions, he says this is interesting but not obligatory. He suggests greater coverage in national and local press.

At 1831 GMT Piryazeva suggests that the events in Lithuania be regarded separately. She also suggests the use of television's first program to reach a wider audience. Full relays should be ended, as such relays are abused by some deputies to make their point, wasting time of session, she says. Under no circumstances should links with electorate be lost and there should be time specially allocated for meeting electorate.

At 1835 GMT Shamikhin says there should be full coverage of joint sessions. Words heard cannot be replaced by written ones, he claims. On the organization of the work of the Supreme Soviet, he calls for greater discipline and order. he agrees there should be at least an approximate schedule of work. He warns that only 40 days remain of the session, and very little has so far been done. A working group coordinating planning of work is needed, he states.

At 1841 GMT Pivovarov, member of the Committee for the Work of Soviets, says his committee has distributed copies of the draft law on local self-government. He reads a letter from deputies calling for this draft to be discussed urgently. Apparently there have been many complaints that the law on status of deputies is not being implemented in the localities, he states, and calls for this law to be implemented.

At 1844 GMT Kurtashin of the Industry and Energy Commission asserts that the draft decision upsets the previously agreed priority for discussion. He stresses the importance of the bill on taxation and warns about the consequences of delays on this matter. He points out discrepancies in what different industries are permitted to do with foreign currency income.

Media Coverage Discussed

LD1903201990

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television in Russian at 1851 GMT continues carrying its recording of the USSR Supreme Soviet joint chambers session held in the Kremlin on 19 March. Deputy Kalmykov of the Committee on Legislation calls for a coordinating group that should arrange the joint discussion by committees and commissions of bills, and says a commission on procedure is needed. The congress showed that there are grave shortcomings in this area. The Committee for Legislation should deal with this matter, but it does not have the resources he notes. On foreign trips by parliamentarians, he says they should be of specific benefit to deputies and the parliament, not simply symbolic trips. Laws should be drawn up by lawyers with participation of other deputies, and the Supreme Soviet should draw up a plan of laws that need to be adopted, he states.

At 1857 GMT Stepanov says Fridays should be allocated to meetings with the electorate. He says there is no more important law than the law on local self-government.

At 1901 GMT Lukyanov says many written proposals have come in, and contends the draft decision requires substantial revision. Many proposals have not been included, he notes. He suggests that debates now be ended. He is seen leafing through a pile of proposals. He holds a vote on whether to end debates. The debates are ended.

At 1906 GMT, Lukyanov replying to written questions, says that it will take time for the presidential mechanism to come fully into play. Several issues have been brought forward with the introduction of the presidency; laws such as the Law on Taxation, Pensions, and Enterprises are priorities. Chernobyl and AIDS are also legislative issues for the near future. The draft law on Interior Ministry troops could be passed into law if the Soviet of Nationalities took a corresponding vote. However, the time frame for passing such laws is being breached because deputies are returning to issues that already were discussed in committees and commissions, he states.

At 1910 GMT Lukyanov says that a commission on procedure will be created. He says he has attempted to give everybody the floor during debates, but deputies must show mutual understanding. He says that the main work of deputies remains at the Supreme Soviet, and it is not acceptable for deputies to disappear to all corners of the country before a law is passed.

At 1914 GMT Lukyanov proposes that the draft resolution should be left to the next joint sitting of the two chambers. Lukyanov then reads proposals concerning television coverage of the Supreme Soviet. Some want coverage to be limited to two hours for joint sittings of the chambers, and to one hour for a separate sitting of one chamber; they also propose that the mass media provide extra coverage of the work of the committees and commissions.

At 1919 GMT Lukyanov expresses his view that deputies are not now so frequently seeking the television limelight. Lukyanov proposes that the issue of television coverage be voted on by the deputies.

At 1921 GMT Deputy Yudin says that immediately after the institution of the presidency, efforts are now being made to cut glasnost by reducing coverage of the Supreme Soviet. Deputy Bisher says that the question of television coverage could be reviewed at the next session. Deputy Rogozhina says that it is too early to make such a decision, and that such a decision will not influence the efficiency or otherwise of the work of the Supreme Soviet. Another deputy says that it is important that speeches should be carried in the press, and that speakers should be identified.

At 1926 GMT Deputy Nikolskiy says that this issue of television coverage should be sent to the Committee on Glasnost for debate. Lukyankov agrees to this.

At 1928 GMT a deputy proposes that sittings of the two chambers should be simultaneous, so that the commissions and committees can meet in a full complement.

At 1929 GMT an unidentified deputy asks whether any deputy who so wishes can be present when the draft resolution on organization of deputies' work is discussed. Lukyanov agrees to this.

At 1930 GMT, Deputy Yarin asks for deputies to be allowed to spend the first week of April at home. Lukyanov promises that this matter will be reviewed.

At 1931 GMT, Lithuanian Deputy Egidiyus Bichkauskas is invited to speak by Lukyanov. There are shouts from the hall. Bichkauskas speaks:

"The situation in the republic is normal, and is under the control of the Republican Government. Last Saturday, the Supreme Council of the Lithuanian Republic, of which I am a member, and therefore also a deputy of the Lithuanian Supreme Council, discussed the decision of the Congress of USSR People's Deputies of 15 March 1990. I have a letter on this question for president of the USSR, Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, and I hope to hand it personally to Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev."

"During the course of the discussions the Supreme Council of the republic reaffirmed the unshakability of its decisions on the restoration of an independent Lithuanian state. It stated that it would take all measures to ensure law and order, and to guarantee by the Lithuanian State generally accepted international norms and agreements on human rights. At the same time the Supreme Council once again called upon the USSR to tackle existing questions by means of interstate talks, and authorized to tackle questions connected with the organization of these talks between the Lithuanian Republic and the USSR the following people, who are evidently well known to you: Vaidotas Antanaitis, who is the coordinator; members of the government of the Lithuanian Republic Algirdas Brazauskas, Jurate Kupliauskiene, Nikolay Medvedev, Jouzas Oleka, and myself."

"Thank you for your attention."

Lukyanov responds: "I can tell you, comrades, that the president of the USSR, the Supreme Soviet and the heads of chambers, and the government will fulfill your instruction, which was given at the congress on this question, consistently and persistently, and will inform all deputies and all the public and all the people on the steps taken."

At 1933 GMT, Lukyanov says that tomorrow [20 March], the Soviet of the Union will meet at 0700 GMT. He declares the sitting closed.

Primakov Informs Supreme Soviet on Agenda

LD1903110690 Moscow TASS in English 1040 GMT 19 Mar 90

[Text] Moscow March 19 TASS—By TASS parliamentary corespondent:

Chairman of the Council of the Union Yevgeniy Primakov informed the Supreme Soviet about those agenda items that he moved to discuss first and foremost.

They include the new federal treaty and the mechanism for the secession of union republics from the USSR. He also moved to discuss new legal acts intended to accelerate the fulfillment of earlier adopted laws on land, ownership and leasing. They include bills on taxation, principles of local self-government and on socialist enterprises.

The next group of legal acts deals with the enforcement of law and order: bills on interior troops, on emergency situations and on legal responsibility for extremist calls and actions to forceably overthrow the existing system. Measures to clean up the consequences of the Chernobyl disaster are also priority issues.

In order to draw up all these acts properly and to accelerate their adoption, the Council of the Union and the Council of Nationalities will hold separate meetings more frequently than previously. "This week, for instance," chairman of the Council of Nationalities Rafik Nishanov said, "the two chambers will hold separate meetings on Wednesday, Thursday, and Friday."

It was also announced that ministers of the USSR will answer deputies' questions once a month in order to toughen parliamentary control over the governments activities.

Primakov Gives Speech 19 March

LD1903222590 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1604 GMT 19 Mar 90

[Speech by Yevgeniy Maksimovich Primakov, Politburo candidate member, at the USSR Supreme Soviet joint chambers session held in the Kremlin on 19 March—recorded]

[Text] Esteemed comrade chairman of the Supreme Soviet, esteemed comrade people's deputies. Naturally, the Congress of People's Deputies, that has just completed its work, shed light on certain shortcomings in our work and, as a consequence, should affect us, our work, and our activity. Here this is all quite obvious.

Therefore, I would like to touch on certain matters that follow directly from the discussions at the congress, and from the documents adopted, from the congress' decisions. The first question is that of priorities for examining the various bills. It is quite obvious, I think, that we need to put special emphasis currently on preparing a law on a new treaty of alliance [soyuznyy dogovor] and a law on secession: A law on the mechanism of secession of Union republics from the Soviet Union in the event of such a situation arising. We have to move this matter forward here, and try to concentrate all our efforts in the committees and commissions, and in the chambers, on preparing and drawing up these draft laws. The situation in the Baltic republics and other regions demands of us special efforts in this area of our work. Therefore it seems to me that it would be correct that the chambers should now give these two bills separate first readings, and then exchange comments and prepare themselves for the second reading. For this we have certain opportunities, although we need to concentrate all our efforts on this work, as one of these bills—the new treaty of the Union—is only in the initial stage of drafting.

As for the other bill, on the mechanism of secession, this has already been examined by a considerable number of the commissions and committees, and only three commissions and committees have not yet examined it. Further, we have passed very important laws of an economic or socioeconomic nature: The land law, the leasehold law, and the property law. Now we need a new series of laws that would help to implement these enormous breakthroughs in legislative initiative we have achieved. What does this involve? First, it is a matter of laws connected with taxing both enterprises and the incomes of the population, and of course, concerning the general principles of local self-government and local economic activity, and also the socialist enterprise.

The third law, on the socialist enterprise, is also only at the initial stage of being formulated, as it were, in the appropriate committees; there are many disagreements and differing interpretations that will have to be overcome in the process of the work, and the committees and commissions must submit to us their comments and their suggestions.

The next group of laws that we should also at least begin without fail at this session—no, some of the economic ones we'll have to begin. We may not be able to pass them all at this session, but what I want to speak of now is the bill relating to security and public order. Here, this group has more or less been prepared, and my colleagues in the Soviet of the Union know that we have already examined some of them in both a first and a second reading—for example, we have already examined and passed the law on Ministry of Interior troops, so it's now up to our colleagues in the Soviet of Nationalities, or another chamber. Evidently we need to examine in a second reading in the Soviet of the Union the law on a state of emergency and on intensifying responsibility for inciting and carrying out extremist actions directed at overthrowing the existing system by force, and changing by force the integrity of our state. So these are the questions that we also have to expedite today, and examine as soon as possible.

Thus, I want to say once again, that there are three groups of these bills. One group is made up of bills relating to interethnic relations, to the move that we are now carrying out away from a unitary state toward a federation. The second group of laws relates to the economy. This is the second layer of bills that as laws will help to implement these most important laws that we have already adopted. And the third group of laws are on security and order.

Now, it seems to me that it would be absolutely correct—and here we were surely mistaken when we put Chernobyl in 21st place [on the agenda]. This is not right. It should be brought forward, without doubt, and this matter must, without fail, be examined, compulsorily, as one of the most important. I think that our attention should also be drawn to this. This also follows on from the decision and discussions at the congress.

The next question. You will recall and, strictly speaking, this view was expressed not only at the congress, but also here, that the chambers should do more work separately. We should respond to this matter. I think that, all in all, objectively, it so happened that in the initial stages we worked more together, in joint sessions. This was natural because we needed to carry through a very great number of bills, do a large amount of work, and, perhaps, in the initial stages this was justified. But now we need more and more to work in each chamber, because this work is more productive. That is why it is planned to hold separate sittings of chambers this week—on the 21st, the 22d, and the 23d. The separate sittings will be held as follows:

On the 21st, our chamber, the Chamber of the Union, will sit in the morning, while the Soviet of Nationalities will sit in the second half of the day; on the 22d it will be the other way around; and on the 23d it will again be us in the morning and they will sit in the second half of the day. It must be said that, all in all, this method of working during one half of the day leaves things free for

committees and commissions to sit, something that is, likewise, extraordinarily important.

As for the next group of issues: It was said at the congress that it is necessary to increase control over the implementation of the bills we are working on and of the laws that we pass. It is one of the most important aspects of the activities of the Supreme Soviet, a most important aspect, because it has two main functions—to make laws and to exercise control over the executive bodies, over the implementation of the laws we are adopting. Despite the fact that we hear sharp utterances about the government, utterances that are at times altogether inappropriate, and the forms in which this is done are inappropriate, too, we nevertheless fail to exercise real control here along this line.

In accordance with what has been agreed with the government—and we put this formula to it, and obviously this must be introduced and we will be introducing it—on each final Wednesday in a month, when a Supreme Soviet session is in progress, the leaders of the government and the ministers will reply to all the questions put to them in advance by deputies. They ought in advance to be ready for this, and that is why the process of receiving these questions will be stopped a week before each last Wednesday. These questions must be put through the chairmen of the chambers. We will ask the government to reply to all questions from our deputies in as minute detail as possible on each last Wednesday.

The next issue is that of discipline, comrades, our discipline. Well, the discipline among deputies frequently leaves much to be desired. I understand that very many people are constrained by their local work, by meeting the voters, and so forth, but what is necessary is that we should introduce a law; if you like, a law for us: When the session is in progress, save for rare exceptions—and these should be extraordinary events—when the chambers gather to hold joint sittings, everyone ought to be present. If foreign trips come into the picture at that time, naturally these ought only to take place at a time when parliamentary delegations are travelling at times previously arranged, and in all other cases only during the period of recess. We must stick rigidly to this rule, otherwise we will not be able to work with our full efficiency.

However, we are talking about discipline, and we intend to provide everyone with this information about attendance, and so on. We have a whole number of comrades who, for inadequate reasons, do not attend, or at least for reasons that are not known to us, therefore we can consider them to be inadequate reasons. I think that we must do away with this, and as rotation will be upon us, not straightaway, naturally, but at the next congress, so especially now we must get discipline sorted out so that, after the next rotation, we will be able to make our numbers up with those who wish to work, who are able to work, who are not occupied elsewhere, and at the same time, so that we get rid of those comrades who already realize that at the moment they are unable to give their full attention to the work of the Soviet parliament.

If we are talking about discipline, of course here we must single out the question about deputies' ethnics. We already have a commission for ethics; we no longer resemble to quite such an extent as was perhaps the case before the undisciplined circle of participants, but nevertheless there are things that should be eradicated from our parliamentary activity. These are, first, crude expressions with regard to one's colleagues, hanging labels on people, and absolutely incomprehensible fury during speeches. All this must be toned down a bit, so to speak, and we must approximate more and more toward a respectful debate, toward respectful criticism and, at all events, attacks of any extent are altogether unacceptable on the chairman of the Supreme Soviet—this is absolutely...[changes thought] all these cases should, it seems to me, be dealt with in the Ethics Commission. The question should be taken up straightaway in the Ethics Commission.

The next question is the organization of our work, since the main load of our work does, nevertheless, rest on the work of the committees and commissions. This is correct, and you and I have come to the conclusion that this is correct. We must, firstly, observe the standing orders very strictly, and the standing orders are, comrades, that the first reading is a conceptual discussion of a question. During the first reading we must not allow ourselves to get into specific details or specific articles. All this does is take up everyone's time, and gains nothing. The main work therefore should be carried out in the commissions and committees, and all the remarks on the articles, after the first reading, should be sent in written form to the committees and commissions, so that in the second reading we can pass the floor only, in the first place, to the chairman of the head committee and the chairmen of those committees that work jointly on laws if they have opinions that differ from the chairman of the head committee, and only to those who are dissatisfied with the replies of the head committee to their remarks set in written form. Only to those and to no one else, because otherwise, certain comrades here speak only for television, and these speeches follow each other, each one the same as the last, in the committees, during first readings, and during second readings. And this takes up an enormous amount, it takes up our time, and this is time needed for the adoption of vital laws. That means that it is not only our time that is being taken up, but the whole country's time. Time is taken away from the whole country and from our work. It seems to me here that the chairmen, all those who are going to chair our sessions should keep a very strict eye on the standing order and simply stop people. You know, there was an occasion, for example, at the congress, when—it is true that it was not a member of the partliament, or rather, not a member of the Supreme Soviet—one of the deputies standing near us wanted to speak about one of the candidacies. Discussion of this candidacy had already ended, and he was asked: Which candidacy are you going to speak about?

And he said: It makes no difference to me. [laughter] You see. There are such people. There are such people. We must put an end to this.

A big question for ensuring that the committees and commissions work properly, a very big question, is the renewal of the committees and commissions. We have already reached the point when we are very well aware that a whole number of comrades, and the overwhelming majority in the committees and commissions, work very well, devoting all their efforts, knowledge, and experience. But there are people who, in general, do not attend sittings of these committees and commissions and, if they do attend, are of little use. Therefore, it is proposed that all of us who are heads of committees and commissions should undertake to speak directly and openly to our colleagues so that we are given a list for renewal. What is more, please also give us the names of the candidates whom you would like to participate in the work of the committees and commissions, in place of those who will leave them. This should be done without delay.

It is envisaged, since our coordination is, it has to be said, weak, it is envisaged that twice a month, without fail, there should be meetings of the chairmen of the committees and commissions with the chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet in order to organize this coordination, to distribute somehow the work among themselves, to speak about tasks of top priority, and to work together in order to tackle these top priority tasks, because all this, naturally, depends on the collective and joint work of all committees and commissions.

These groups of matters that I have named, as I see it, follow on from the work of the congress. They should be registered, and they are reflected in the draft decision that has been handed to you. Thank you for your attention.

Lithuanian Deputy Reads Parliamentary Address

LD1903130890 Moscow TASS in English 1243 GMT 19 Mar 90

[By TASS parliamentary correspodent]

[Text] Moscow March 19 TASS—At the end of today's plenary session of the USSR Supreme Soviet, Deputy Egidius Bickauskas of Lithuania read out the Lithuanian Parliament's address.

The situation in the Republic is "normal, and the Lithuanian Government is in control," he said.

On Saturday, Lithuania's Supreme Soviet discussed the resolution of the Congress of Soviet People's Deputies on Lithuania and "confirmed its resolution to restore Lithuanian independence."

The Lithuanian Supreme Soviet urged the Soviet Union to "solve the question through inter-state talks."

Bickauskas said a letter on the issue will be conveyed to President Mikhail Gorbachev.

This afternoon and on Tuesday deputies will continue to work in Supreme Soviet committees and commission.

On Wednesday, both houses of the Soviet Parliament will meet separately to discuss bills on a new union accord, separation of powers between the centre and the republics and on secession from the Soviet Union.

Deputies Discuss Situation in Lithuania

LD1903204490 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1644 GMT 19 Mar 90

[Contributions by Deputies Kogan, Primakov, and session Chairman Lukyanov at the USSR Supreme Soviet joint chambers session held in the Kremlin in Moscow on 19 March—recorded]

[Text] [Lukyanov] Go ahead, Deputy Kogan.

[Kogan] A question along these lines: I would like to know how we are going to implement the resolution of the extraordinary congress on examination of the situation in the Baltic, in Lithuania in particular, and straight away regarding this proposal, on my own behalf and that of a small group of deputies, we ask that the ministers of foreign affairs, internal affairs, and the KGB be invited, and that they report to us on the situation, what is happening there, because prior to making a decision it is essential to be in full possession of the information. Thank you.

[Primakov] I would like to reply to Deputy Kogan. A three-day time period has been designated here, as you know, in the message that was signed by the president. There will be appropriate instructions regarding this, evidently, for the government, and requests to the Supreme Soviet, and work will proceed. But at the moment, it seems to me, we should not begin by reporting on the situation through all the channels, so to speak. These reports are made in the Presidential Council; evidently they will be made, but the main thing at the current time is to concentrate on the reaction, which is inevitable, and which must certainly contribute to there being guarantees for all strata of the population, irrespective of their belonging or not belonging to the indigenous population, guarantees of protection of enterprises of all-union status, and so on. All this, as well as some sort of new conditions are evidently already needed, and all of this will be done. But currently, let's not force the pace. We await a reply. A period of three days has been given.

[Lukyanov] I will certainly give you the floor, Deputy Bichkauskas. You are asking. I will give you the floor.

Clearly, some information from the Lithuanian deputies, although I have to say that I have received a report today that a decision has been made by the Lithuanian Supreme Soviet on the status of our deputies. You

understand that no one, apart from the electorate, could change this status. But we'll talk about this.

Broadcasting of Supreme Soviet Discussed

LD1903114890 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1000 GMT 19 Mar 90

[Excerpts] At the session of the USSR Supreme Soviet. Over to All-Union Radio Correspondent Aleksandr Ruvinskiy in the Kremlin:

[Ruvinskiy] Today the joint sitting of the chambers of the Supreme Soviet is devoted to organizational questions of the session's work. [passage omitted]

What other issues were raised? The provision of information on the deputies' work. Many deputies have spoken about the expediency of brodcasting a recording or a relay of the session. But there are contradictory opinions on this point. One proposal is to broadcast a report on the working day of the session before 1400 daily. But many deputies consider that if such were the case, subjectivity could arise. And the following trend has become noticeable: Deputies who speak relatively infrequently at the sessions are more often than not against broadcasting infrequently at the sessions and more often than not against broadcasting or relaying them. However, Deputy Engler introduced a proposal to thank the mass media for its attention to the session. In his opinion our papers, radio, and television are doing major useful work. A proposal was also expressed to more widely publish deputies' speeches in the local press. But for the moment the question of even today's evening complete broadcast of today's session is still open. I think that there will be a vote on it, and to all appearances this afternoon the session will work in committees and commissions.

Text of Ownership Law Enabling Resolution

PM1203134190 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 10 Mar 90 Second Edition pp 1, 2

[Text of "USSR Supreme Soviet Resolution on the Enactment of the USSR Law 'On Ownership in the USSR'"]

[Text] The USSR Supreme Soviet resolves:

1. To enact the USSR Law "On Ownership in the USSR" on 1 July 1990.

2. Current acts of legislation of the USSR and union and autonomous republics, insofar as they are not at variance with this law, are to apply henceforth until the legislation of the USSR and union republics is brought into line with the USSR Law "On Ownership in the USSR." Here decisions of the government of the USSR and the governments of union and autonomous republics issued prior to the enactment of this law on questions which, under the law, may be regulated only by acts of legislation shall operate henceforth until the adoption of the relevant acts of legislation.

3. The USSR Law "On Ownership in the USSR" applies to legal relations arising after the enactment of the law, that is to say, 1 July 1990.

As far as legal relations arising prior to 1 July 1990 are concerned, the USSR Law "On Ownership in the USSR" applies only to those rights and duties arising after the enactment of the law.

The provisions of Point 2 of Article 7 of the aforementioned law apply to legal relations arising both prior and subsequent to 1 July 1990.

4. The provisions of the USSR Law "On Ownership in the USSR" relating to state ownership—unionwide ownership, the ownership of union republics, autonomous republics, autonomous oblasts, and autonomous okrugs, and municipal ownership—enter into force as property is demarcated in terms of the aforementioned kinds of ownership.

The USSR Council of Ministers, jointly with the governments of union republics and with the participation of autonomous republics, is to ensure the demarcation of property in terms of unionwide and union republic ownership by 1 July 1991. Here the basis is that union republics' property should also include, in addition to the property of enterprises, establishments, and organizations of republic jurisdiction, the property of enterprises, establishments, and organizations of union jurisdiction which are being transferred to the ownership of a union republic.

To establish that the demarcation of property in terms of that which belongs to a union republic and that which belongs to its autonomous republics, autonomous oblasts, autonomous okrugs, and administrative-territorial formations is to be carried out according to the procedure fixed by the acts of legislation of union and autonomous republics, proceeding from the principles envisaged by the first and second parts of this article.

5. Cases referred by the USSR Law "On Ownership in the USSR" to the jurisdiction of the court and state arbitration and still proceeding in administrative and other organs by 1 July 1990 will be subject to examination by courts and organs of state arbitration in accordance with the established jurisdiction.

6. The rules on the defense of the right of ownership envisaged by Articles 32-34 of the USSR Law "On Ownership in the USSR" also apply to demands that arise prior to the law's enactment.

The right to compensation for damages caused to an owner by the adoption of an act of legislation terminating the right of ownership applies to acts adopted after the law's enactment.

7. The USSR Council of Ministers is instructed:

to introduce in 1990 the following drafts for examination by the USSR Supreme Soviet:

acts of USSR legislation regulating relations concerning the creation and utilization of inventions, discoveries, works of science, literature, the arts, and other items of intellectual property;

an act of legislation defining the kinds of property which out of considerations of state and public security or in accordance with USSR international treaties may not be in citizens' ownership;

acts of legislation on joint-stock companies and other economic companies and associations;

to submit proposals to the USSR Supreme Soviet by 1 July 1990 on creating a state body empowered to administer property in unionwide ownership;

to bring decisions of the USSR government into line with the USSR Law "On Ownership in the USSR" by 1 July 1990;

to ensure the revision of normative acts, including instructions, by ministries, state committees, and departments of the USSR and the abrogation of those at variance with the aforementioned law by 1 July 1990;

to submit proposals to the USSR Supreme Soviet by 1 July bringing USSR acts of legislation into line with the USSR Law "On Ownership in the USSR."

8. The supreme soviets of union and autonomous republics are to bring the legislation of union and autonomous republics into line with this law.
[Signed] M. Gorbachev, chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet.
The Kremlin, Moscow, 6 March 1990.

Congress of People's Deputies

PRAVDA Account of Gorbachev News Conference

PM1903124190 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 17 Mar 90 Second Edition pp 1,7

[TASS report: "M.S. Gorbachev's News Conference"]

[Text] It has already been announced that M.S. Gorbachev gave a news conference in the Kremlin 15 March straight after the extraordinary Third Congress of USSR People's Deputies had completed its work.

The president said the following: Good evening, esteemed ladies and gentlemen, dear comrades! The Third Extraordinary Congress of USSR People's Deputies, which was convened to resolve important and, I would say, fundamental questions for our country and the policy of perestroyka, has ended. The very logic of the perestroyka processes led us to adopt these decisions, which involve fundamental changes in the upper echelons of power and the introduction of the institution of the presidency for the first time in our history.

A year or even a few months ago we proceeded on the premise that this was inadvisable under our conditions. Now events have gathered great momentum and processes are proceeding in a contradictory manner. In the last few months we have covered ground which we might possibly have taken decades to cover in conditions of evolution. That is why things that seemed correct several months ago are already proving inadequate in the new conditions. It is the processes of democratization, which have embraced all spheres in the life of our society—the economy, the political process, and the social and cultural spheres—along with the decentralization and transformation of the Soviet federation that have all provoked powerful centrifugal forces. We sensed that counterbalances were needed, mechanisms that would balance these processes in order to prevent our ship from capsizing.

The acuteness of the current situation and the need to speed up perestroyka also dictated the need to improve our executive mechanism. We discovered that many important laws from which we expected profound changes are being implemented slowly. We cannot resign ourselves to this; there is alarm within society about it.

We have abandoned one system—the administrative-edict system—but the new methods have not begun to work in conditions of democracy and radical economic and political reform. Society has, as it were, found itself at a transitional stage, it is being subjected to great trials, there is the threat of destabilization. This transitional period must be reduced and compressed as much as possible and new political and economic mechanisms started up. So, it was not only our strategic plans that necessitated these radical solutions but also the real situation that prompted this. I do not want to exaggerate the significance of the decisions that have been adopted, but they must not be underestimated either.

M.S. Gorbachev answered questions from Soviet and foreign correspondents.

NOVOSTI: How do you see your first international initiative as president?

Answer: I will use my new powers to impart greater dynamism to the initiatives we have put forward. It is not a matter of amazing the world with yet another new proposal but of adding fresh momentum to those proposals that we have already put forward.

PRAVDA: How long do you think it will take to establish the system of presidential power?

Answer: In order to introduce presidential power, it is indeed not only necessary to elect a president but also to create a whole system. We must act without delay to ensure that the president gets down to work straightaway. Incidentally, he was given his first instructions at the congress regarding the situation in Lithuania. So, there will be no particular time for reflection. Action has to be taken and a system of presidential rule created.

IZVESTIYA: Every day in parliament we encounter clashes of opinion over the adoption of decisions and it

often looks as though these decisions lose their motive force and are fulfilled badly as a result. How far will presidential power help to eliminate this situation?

Answer: I hope and am sure that, once the potential of the institution of the presidency has been developed, we will obtain a more effective executive institution. This will enable us to overcome the amorphous, vague nature of power. We will not consider this a panacea for all ills; that would be ridiculous. It is the combination of a Supreme Soviet, which is vigorously picking up a good speed and becoming competent, with the new organs of Soviet power, which are being formed on the basis of elections in the republics and localities, and the regrouping of forces within the government that will make it possible to act more effectively. But we must first overcome the irresponsibility generated by references to collegiality and demands for every question to be resolved by a collegium. We reckon that increased responsibility should be the most important result of the introduction of the presidency as an institution of executive power.

The Vremya program: We know that as head of state you are now faced with many problems, but there are probably one or two highly urgent problems. What are they?

Answer: I would say that there is more than one problem. We must radicalize economic reform. We must tackle the renewal of the union treaty and the federation as a matter or urgency, and we must take more resolute steps to reinforce people's security and guarantee defense of their rights and freedoms. We must defend perestroyka and democracy in general.

THE GUARDIAN (Britain): Mr. President, Comrade President! You are still the general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee but you have of late renounced a number of positions which previously figured in communist parties' theory and practice, such as the dictatorship of the proletariat, the one-party system, and so on. Can you explain which specific aspects of your political philosophy distinguish you from social democrats and do you consider yourself to be more of a social democrat than a communist?

Answer: I not only consider myself a member of the Central Committee but also a communist. That does not lessen my respect for representatives of other socialist trends and their quest. What is more, the realization that we are one civilization and live within the framework of an interconnected world and that every people, by realizing their choice, are at the same time also exploiting civilization's achievements presupposes that we, too, by deciding to impart new dynamism to socialism via perestroyka and reveal its potential, will at the same time also make use of other people's experience in conformity with our conditions. The main point is that we must avoid everything that inflicted great damage on the realization of the socialist idea when we tried to impose or tried to copy a single model. In this context deformations were permitted which cost us dear and to some extent damaged the socialist idea itself.

But even after all this and after experiencing all the blows of fate, our people retained their faith in the socialist idea. This is the basis on which, by analyzing all past experience and making use of the achievements of world civilization, notably of socialist movements in the world, we are to enrich our socialist policy, which we have called perestroyka, and accomplish what we set out to do when we made our choice in 1917. We will not copy anyone else's experience and will not foist our perestroyka on anyone. From the very outset when we embarked on this path, I have been repeating that we need perestroyka, our society came to it through suffering, we are not imposing our choice. If anyone is interested in it, please study our experience, if it is useful, apply it. That is how we will act with regard to other movements.

"Mayak" All-Union Radio: What will be the first steps that you take to improve the economy, which is, to put it mildly, marking time?

Answer: My first steps will comprise measures linked with the radicalization of economic reform. I am profoundly convinced that the answer to the problems lies in rapidly cranking up the new mechanisms rather than in a return to the administrative-edict system. That is the direction in which the first steps will be taken. This firstly involves urgent actions to normalize the market situation. As for the future, we must make use of the new opportunities afforded by the laws on ownership, on land, on the lease, and so on. We must proceed to reduce state control and broaden opportunities for initiative to be displayed and for questing. Economic freedom should bear fruit.

RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA: To what extent do you intend to rely on the working movement and are you satisfied with the information which you receive from working regions?

Answer: If you noticed, when I addressed the Soviet people at the end of my speech today my first words were directed to the working class in hope of support. I am convinced that it is a social force which is firmly devoted to the socialist idea and the struggle for perestroyka. The opinion of the working class and its position will determine the success of the whole business. That is why I attach tremendous significance to the working movement and its role in perestroyka. As for information, I receive it through various channels, but I value personal contacts above all. I am also grateful to RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA. In my opinion, it is forming its personality and one is conscious of its working-class character, so to speak.

EL PAIS (Spain): We recently learned that the Defense Council no longer exists and that its functions are to be transferred to the Presidential Council. What was behind the decision to disband the Defense Council, and how

did it fail to please? And further. You are empowered to issue decrees. Is there a list of questions on which you intend to issue decrees, for instance, more radical economic steps than those enumerated in the government program?

Answer: I want to provide the following clarification on the first question. In principle things are not changing that much. The chairman of the Supreme Soviet was the head of the Defense Council. Leadership of the Armed Forces along with security and defense questions come within the remit of the president today. I believe that a considerable proportion of those people who were involved in the work of the Defense Council will continue to take part and assist the president in resolving these questions. So, there is complete continuity here.

As for the second question, we must first of all take care to improve the effectiveness of the mechanism for implementing the government's proposed program. But we must speed up the resolution of many problems which, according to the government program, were scheduled for a later date.

Uzbek Television and Radio: Esteemed Comrade President, in a few days' time, on 21 March, Navruz—the spring festival marking the first day of the New Year—will be celebrated in many Muslim countries abroad and also in our Central Asian Republics. What would the first president of the Soviet Union like to say on his first working day to the peoples of the East, in the Soviet Union and abroad?

Answer: I would like to express profound respect for the peoples of the East. I am aware that in that region, which encompasses many countries, there are also many problems. I believe that the peoples of the East are characterized above all by a striving for peace because of the unrest in their region and, of course, by a striving for a better life. I would like to express the hope that people's expectations and hopes will come true.

This also applies to our country. What is happening in our country today will also have a fruitful impact on the transformations in the Central Asian republics. I believe that great changes are necessary there.

PRIZYV (Vladimir City): During the congress two deputies announced their resignation from the deputy corps. Could this be an indication of an emerging trend, in your opinion, and what is your attitude to this?

Answer: I talked to one of the deputies, and in my opinion this is not yet an irreversible process, so to speak. This applies above all to the deputies who are part of the Supreme Soviet. The situation has changed, the position of these people has changed, they have had the opportunity to work in new conditions, they are assessing whether this is acceptable to them or not. In any case, some people feel that they cannot live up to their promises. In general, I believe, this is a normal process. I see no tragedy in this, and I do not envisage a mass exodus from the deputy corps.

TASS: Who will stand in for you when you are on vacation?

Answer: No matter where the president is, and that includes vacations, he will implement leadership. Part of the day-to-day business will, of course, be delegated to members of the Presidential Council; however, no fundamental question will be resolved without the president.

MBC Television Network (South Korea): Esteemed Mr. President, how do you assess the prospects of the establishment of diplomatic relations between the Soviet Union and South Korea?

Answer: I rate them positively.

MOSKOVSKIY KOMSOMOLETS: It is obvious right now that the Supreme Soviet has quite clearly fallen behind as regards the law on the withdrawal of republics from the USSR. The situation is complex; could it not happen that the law which is about to be adopted in the near future comes to be regarded as a punitive measure, as it were, and is it not necessary to avoid this?

Answer: First of all, there is a lot of talk about delays, indecision, half-measures, and so forth. It is necessary to be very careful, and I would like to impress this on our Soviet press. As for the foreign press, it is its own affair. And to you I can say what I would wish as president. Delivering a speech today I said that there are many discussions in our country claiming that we have fallen behind with laws on ownership, land, and everything connected with the radical economic reform. You know, this is right, and it is not right. Yes, it would have been better to have adopted them sooner. But how could we have done it sooner if even now we feel that we lack knowledge, experience, and competence, that we are only gradually building up experience of life. We have tried out the contract system, economic accountability, self-management, and democracy as regards the election of directors and so forth. All these are new forms, and in order to incorporate them in a law, to create a legal basis, it is necessary for a lot of water to flow under the bridge. In major changes of policy, and we are implementing historic changes and creating preconditions which will change the nature of our society, haste is impermissible. I can forgive young people, I can forgive MOSKOVSKIY KOMSOMOLETS, when they urge on their elders. This is good. As for others, however, I would advise them not to get carried away in their use of strident language.

I realize that life is hard for the press without this sometimes, people may even refuse to read it. Headlines have to catch the eye, it does not matter what is in the text, it is important to have a headline. However, we should all give a lot of thought to how we report what we are doing. Because what we are doing is of tremendous, historic, global importance, it will determine the destiny of both our country and socialism as an idea, and, in the light of the real weight which our country carries, it will affect the situation throughout the world. Therefore we

must be both bold and decisive and circumspect and cautious. After all, we have 300 million people behind us not only in our country.

POLITIKA (Yugoslavia): Your policy of new thinking has been advancing major positive initiatives for changes in the world over the past five years. Today you put forward a radical idea proposing to replace the bloc systems by a joint security organization. By what specific steps are you hoping to ensure the success of this radical idea?

Answer: Life is prompting our thoughts, our quest, and our policy. The question of the unification of Germany, in particular, is forcing us to think about this so as to ensure that there are no distortions, that the balance of forces in not impaired as a result of this act toward which the Germans are, naturally, moving. For this reason we must not just ponder this now, but move on to the realm of practical actions. We must, above all, follow the path of giving new content to existing blocs, and create new structures. That is to say, we must change the nature of the former and promote the creation of others. In this way a system will be formed which may provide the foundations for a new edifice of European security. I believe that proceeding via the Vienna process and via Helsinki and taking new steps toward unification and the establishment of economic, trade and economic, scientific, and technical ties, we will proceed toward a Europe which will have lasting and reliable security. Maybe I am painting this picture with bold brush-strokes, but I believe that we will proceed in precisely this direction.

Azerbaijan Television: Will presidential rule be declared in NKAO [Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast] as a result of the introduction of the institution of the presidency? And second: Do you have the right to dissolve the USSR Supreme Soviet and union republic Supreme Soviets?

Answer: As regards the NKAO, and the situation in Azerbaijan and Armenia in general, we have arrived, as a result of many open and closed sessions and frank discussions—respectful and direct discussions at that—at a solution which marks the beginning of a new stage. A belief that this is what we should concentrate on, and nothing else.

As to your second question, I believe that the amendments which have been introduced have already been published. There the president's prerogatives in respect of the dissolution of the Supreme Soviet are strictly confined. He can do so only if a situation arises between the chambers which hampers normal work. Then the president can put the question to the Congress of People's Deputies. He himself cannot dissolve the Supreme Soviet. As for the dissolution of the union republic Supreme Soviets, I believe that this must be ruled out. Generally speaking, the president has sworn an oath to strictly abide by the Constitution, and the Constitution, especially in view of the fact that we are moving toward a new treaty to define the union, must make provision for a clear demarcation of union and republic competence. And this has to be strictly observed by everyone.

MOSKOVSKAYA PRAVDA: You spent your youth in Moscow, you studied here at the university on Hertzen Street, you graduated from the law faculty here. Moscow has become part of your life; you have been elected president here. However, there are many problems in Moscow and we are currently keenly aware of the absence of the status of a capital city. What is your view of the need to adopt a law on Moscow as the capital of the Soviet Union which is important for the future development of Moscow and of the country?

Answer: Thank you for reminding me of my youth, that is always pleasant. I do feel that I am a Muscovite; many events in my personal and sociopolitical life have occurred here. I love Moscow, and the concerns of Muscovites and of this city are close to my heart. It is a complex city if you take account of how many million people live in Moscow itself, and in Moscow Oblast, and how many millions pass through every day—you realize what a vast, complex world it is. Therefore I believe that it is necessary for the president of the country personally to show concern and pay attention to the development of Moscow. The question of the capital's status is currently under discussion, and when this discussion is completed it will be possible to answer your question as to whether there will be a law or some other solution. In any event, it is necessary to define Moscow's present and future. And that is a very urgent task.

IZVESTIYA: How will you organize your mutual relations with the Supreme Soviet and the chairman of the Supreme Soviet? How often do you plan to attend sessions?

Answer: The collaboration of the executive and its top official in the person of the president of the country with the supreme legislative organ will be normal and regular. Nonetheless, I will concentrate more on the work of the Presidential Council and the Council of the Federation. Today we have elected the new chairman of the Supreme Soviet, and I hope that the Supreme Soviet will make headway, we expect important decisions from it.

Moscow [domestic] Radio, Foreign Broadcasting, and "INTERFAX" Service: What qualities will you, as president, be inheriting from you when you were chairman of the Supreme Soviet, and what qualities, if you don't mind my asking, would you like to relinquish?

Answer: I will be the same person. A great number of suggestions were made, you heard how many and in what form they were made, when I was a contender for the post. But it seems to me that I possess one quality—that of being myself.

KYODO News Agency (Japan): A resolution on the Lithuanian issue was adopted at the congress today. How do you regard the idea that a political dialogue with

Lithuania is the only way to solve it. Another question. When did you decide it was necessary to create a presidency?

Answer: We considered it necessary to express the congress' view on the events that have taken place in Lithuania and the decisions adopted by the republic's supreme organs of power. We reckoned that both the Lithuanian people and the country expected it of us, and since we are talking about realities that have taken shape within the framework of the postwar development process, the question affects everyone living in Europe. As a result of the debate the congress displayed firmness and principle: While calling the decisions illegal and suspending their action, it nevertheless confirmed the right of every people to self-determination and instructed the president to safeguard the legitimate rights of all people living in the republic and the protection of the USSR's interests. I said that we do not intend to conduct negotiations, but we will have a dialogue, a respectful dialogue with the people of Lithuania, with representatives of its organs of power, on the future of our relations. It seems to me that it will take time and the Lithuanian people and the Union are keen to find solutions that will above all preserve our union, while ensuring differentiated federative ties on the basis of a new union treaty. If, in the end, on the basis of a referendum, the peoples living in Lithuania decide to secede from the Soviet Union, it must be a process involving the consideration of a whole range of questions, as a result of which the interests of both Lithuania and the Soviet Union would be safeguarded.

The magazine AL-MUSAWWAR (Egypt): There have been many statements about the settlement of emigres on occupied Arab territories. How do you see the situation's being solved, in view of your legislation, of course?

Answer: Indeed, we have brought our legislation on these questions into line with international law. This has changed the situation, and I would not want the Arab world to suspect us of any intentions other than to approach this question from the standpoint of universal human values and international law. This process is more dynamic than before, but we expect everything to be quieter in the very near future. But we are not trying to avoid consultations on these questions since they are an object of common concern. It is necessary to evaluate this issue on the basis of mutual understanding and in the spirit of cooperation and act accordingly.

KRASNAYA ZVEZDA: You are supreme commander in chief of the Armed Forces. There is much talk at the moment about military reform. What is your perception of this?

Answer: We have a new military doctrine and we need Armed Forces perestroyka to be able to implement it. The same goes for the disarmament processes. Military reform must take place in the context of the current situation in the country and in the world today. But one thing is clear: Our attitude toward the Armed Forces, and I want to say this again, is unchanged and we are always thinking about the officers and men. Many problems have accumulated and they must be solved. As a result of the defense reform we must have a modern army that is distinguished by at least two significant features. It has to be professionally trained and have effective modern weapons at its disposal.

RUDE PRAVO (Czechoslovakia): What major decisions will be made at the meeting with Bush, which you mentioned in your program statement?

Answer: There is a whole range of issues taking shape there. We hope that by then we will have arrived at a greater degree of agreement on the reduction of strategic armaments by 50 percent and, as a result of both sides' efforts, we will have been able to form the basis for a treaty. We will be able to exchange views on the European process. It seems to me that there is great scope for cooperation there. We have always thought that the United States and Canada must be involved in the European process and that this should not give rise to any suspicion. I believe that U.S. involvement is an important factor, creating prerequisites for a quest for true balance. There is also the Helsinki-2 summit in the offing and the dynamics of European processes demand regular consultations. Incidentally, this is exactly what is happening at the moment: telephone conversations, correspondence.

As for chemical weapons, joint efforts are being made by both sides. I would add to this list questions relating to the halting of nuclear tests, at least as regards the treaties of 1974 and 1976; it is important to continue the exchange of views on this issue. It seems to me there has to be a serious discussion about wider cooperation in the economic sphere. I imagine we will be discussing regional problems; they always come into Soviet-American meetings. All in all I believe they will be important talks.

Answering a correspondent's question, M.S. Gorbachev said that he intends to meet regularly with the press. USSR Supreme Soviet press center chief A.A. Maslennikov welcomed this promise and asked journalists to put two final questions.

MEDITSINSKAYA GAZETA: In many countries of the world presidents head government commissions to combat AIDS. Since this tragedy is inexorably making inroads into our country and there is no time to lose, do you intend to head a similar government commission?

Answer: I will be frank and say that I had not thought of heading such a commission, but I am sure that the problem requires my attention.

USSR State Committee for Television and Radio Broadcasting: In your speech you expressed satisfaction at the development of relations with the PRC and confirmed our country's adherence to the Vladivostok and Krasnoyarsk initiatives. What, in your view, must be done to

add to what has been gained, to the potential that has been acquired in the Far East, in particular in our relations with the PRC?

Answer: Preparations are even now being made for the PRC premier's visit to our country. I believe it will be a major event that will be a boost to the relations that have been taking shape since my visit to China. We highly value these relations, we cherish them, and we will do all we can to make sure they progress. We have great potential and, I believe, many problems, which will be covered during the upcoming visit. This applies to bilateral relations and the situation in the Asian-Pacific Region. I am convinced that our relations with China will be stable and will progress.

Ye.M. Primakov anmd I.T. Frolov participated in the press conference.

Transcript of Gorbachev Remarks on Lithuania

PM1903110390 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 17 Mar 90 Morning Edition p 11

[Account of remarks by USSR President M.S. Gorbachev at 15 March sitting of Extraordinary Third Congress of USSR People's Deputies from stenographic record of part of 14 March, all of 15 March proceedings]

[Text] M.S. Gorbachev, USSR president: "To the Congress Presidium. A few hours ago we elected a president. Why is M.S. Gorbachev again silent? I congratulate him on his election and ask him to speak on the Lithuanian question. Sergey Vasilyev. Tyumen."

I intend to respond with regard to the essence, but, as regards the form, I would like to say: We are in no way changing the style of communication, not even when the situation changes. I would address this remark to Comrade Vasilyev.

With certain exceptions, the comrades who have spoken are unanimous that the congress cannot complete its work without expressing its attitude toward this cardinal question of our country's internal life and making an assessment of it. We have received many telegrams which attest to very great alarm and concern at what is happening in Lithuania today. People would not understand the congress unless it deemed it necessary during this four-day session to discuss this question and express its attitude. Therefore, comrades, I believe that we acted correctly by developing the debate, although I can see that certain deputies have a different opinion about this. This is the first point.

Second. When discussing this problem, we must see Lithuania, we must see the whole country. I will say even more: Europe and the world. The question must not be simplified. We have shown tremendous patience, and we are showing it today. I believe that respect was still the hallmark of all the speeches.

For the past 18-24 months we have been conducting an active dialogue with our Lithuanian comrades and the Lithuanian people, and I believe that we have so far been acting correctly. And if the process has assumed such acute forms today, I do not think we can blame the center or the representatives of all the republics for this, for they have shown and are showing respect, patience, and a sense of comradeship with regard to the people of Lithuania. At the same time we have approached a point beyond which processes which must be halted begin—and there are already signs of this. We must tell the Lithuanian people, the whole country, and the world frankly about them. The world also awaits the position of the Congress of People's Deputies.

I would proceed from what I said at the start of our work. The congress and all of us, expressing the will of the Soviet people, retain a feeling of respect for our Lithuanian comrades. However, we also cannot forget those who are pushing the Lithuanian people into an historic impasse and who might jeopardize their destiny. We must help both the Lithuanian people and many of those who associate their activity today with the adoption of similar decisions—about which we know, although not about all of them—to realize this. I believe that we can do this while retaining two important aspects in our approach: First, respect and patience; second, principledness and firmness. This must be done.

Generalizing the deputies' speeches and also the amendments and views conveyed to the Presidium, I would say that we could adopt a decision on the basis of the draft of this document, after ridding it of superfluous informativeness and arguments and confining ourselves to the most important political and juridical statements and instructions, which are now so necessary and are dictated by the situation. This will be close to what Comrade Falin said. Incidentally, it is his version that I am taking as the basis.

We could say that during 10-12 March the Lithuanian SSR (Soviet Socialist Republic) Supreme Soviet announced the "restoration" of the Lithuanian state's independence (here we put "restoration" in quotation marks) and the abolition of the Lithuanian SSR Constitution and the USSR Constitution on the republic's territory. This is a fact, and we note it, not ignoring it. Further, the second paragraph on page two can be set forth as follows: "The Congress of People's Deputies regards the aforementioned decisions of the Lithuanian SSR Supreme Soviet as not having legal juridical force." This too is an important statement, and there is no need to further develop or argue this thesis; we all know this. I think the bottom of page 2 is fair: "While possessing the constitutional right to self-determination, a union republic, both on joining and on leaving the federation, cannot ignore the political, socioeconomic, territorial, legal, and other problems that arise from this." Our Lithuanian comrades have been given a warning about this. You will recall that I have said repeatedly that, if someone imagines that this question can be solved by raising hands, by gathering at night, at the double, by forestalling another congress, and so forth, this is very frivolous and irresponsible from the viewpoint of

resolving fateful questions in the life of our people and the whole country. This must be pointed out.

With due regard for what has been expounded the Congress of USSR People's Deputies states that, in accordance with Articles 74 and 75 of the USSR Constitution, the sovereignty of the USSR and the validity of the USSR Constitution still extend to the territory of Lithuania as a union Soviet socialist republic. After this juridical and political statement it is possible to proceed to the decreeing section. The Congress of USSR People's Deputies decrees:

First, while confirming the right of every union republic (Article 72 of the USSR Constitution) to freely secede from the USSR, the Third Congress of People's Deputies recognizes that henceforth, until the adoption of a law defining the procedure and the consequences of secession from the USSR, the decisions adopted by the Lithuanian Republic's Supreme Soviet 10-12 March are invalid because they run counter to Articles 74 and 75 of the USSR Constitution.

This is contained in the statement part of the draft and must be carried over into the decision.

Second, The USSR president is to be entrusted with ensuring the protection of the lawful rights of every person living on the territory of the Lithuanian Republic, as well as the observance of the rights and interests of the USSR and the other union republics on the territory of Lithuania—until the adoption of corresponding decisions on this question by the USSR Supreme Soviet and the government (and you and I gave such instructions on the first day of our Congress' work).

In my opinion, this reflects the most important points. (Applause).

Political & Social

11 Mar CPSU Plenum Debate Speeches Outlined

PM1903173090 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 17 Mar 90 Second Edition pp 2-4

[Debate speeches delivered at CPSU Central Committee Plenum 11 March]

[Text] **Yu.A. Prokofyev (First Secretary of Moscow CPSU Gorkom)**

Unfortunately, the proposed draft USSR Law on Amendments to Articles 6 and 7 of the USSR Constitution was presented to participants in the Central Committee plenum only just now, during the recess, but even a cursory look makes it possible to voice a number of criticisms. The proposed wording of Articles 6 and 7 of the Constitution is essentially a superficial rehash of the articles already contained in the Constitution. I believe that first of all we should introduce into the Constitution an article declaring people's right to unite in different parties and social movements. Thus Article 7 ought to precede Article 6 of the Constitution.

The mechanism for registering the parties that are formed and also for terminating their activity should also be defined here. Of course, we should also retain the existing definition of the permissible limits of political pluralism in society and place barriers in the way of the creation of nationalist, chauvinist, and fascistic formations kindling social, national, and religious strife.

I am convinced that the law that is to be adopted should not single out the CPSU, as the proposed version of Article 6 does. The article should more clearly formulate the spheres of activity in general of parties and social organizations. This activity cannot, in my view, be confined merely to parliamentary activity, as the draft says.

Our position is that the USSR Constitution and other legislative acts should enshrine the right of any party to pursue its policy via party organizations operating both in production and at people's place of residence, via the mass news media, and via party members elected to organs of people's power and working in state institutions. This question is fundamental. These provisions should be introduced into the draft law. In its present version the law may create obstacles to active party work in labor collectives and the elimination of party organizations at enterprises and in institutions will become reality. This may lead to the organizational disintegration of the party, and we have the sad experience of the PZPR [Polish United Workers Party] before us.

The amendment of the articles of the USSR Constitution advances to the ranks of priority tasks the adoption of a law on political parties. I would think that in this case the Central Committee should use its right of legislative initiative and prepare a draft law on political parties and organizations. It should detail juridical norms for the number of advocates of forming a party necessary for its registration, parties' responsibility for their political activity, the procedure for terminating political parties' activity, participation in election campaigns and in the work of representative organs, and other questions. Without such a law we will be unable to implement genuine democratization and freedom of political life.

A. Dzhumagulov (Member of the CPSU Central Auditing Commission and Chairman of the Kirghiz SSR Council of Ministers)

Esteemed comrades, a few very brief remarks about the agenda. Sad to say, we certainly all have a good idea of the critical situation unfortunately prevailing not only in the economy and culture but also in consistent, theoretically gauged, specific party leadership and relations between the CPSU and Soviet society. Yes, there are many unsolved questions in economic development. In a number of cases, unfortunately, the situation has indeed deteriorated seriously. The reform and economic levers are not working. But is it fair to pin the blame for this solely on the government and its leadership without

letting them work creatively for even a day and essentially while shackling them in their offices? We are displaying astonishing impatience and haste and are thereby aggravating the already serious situation in the country.

I believe that the Central Committee, the Politburo, and we all should display wisdom, not succumb to transitory interests, not be hasty even in choosing the strategy of our policy, and not betray our ideals. As a communist, like many other party comrades, I cherish as sacred the cause of our fathers and brothers who gave their lives for the Communist Party cause, for socialism. Yes, I am sorry about the errors and deformations, to put it mildly. But our party found both the courage and the strength to tell the people the truth and to initiate perestroyka of the entire system and of the party itself. The main thing is to preclude anything like that in the future, and a great deal is already being done to this end. There will be no return to the past, there is simply no road leading there.

My second point. It would be an unforgivable mistake not to take effective measures to extricate the party from its state of crisis. The truth is that the crisis in the party is sharpening. After all, what is terrible is not only the fact that destructive political forces are destroying our party's unity, sometimes this is done with malicious intent, which is quite obvious. Something else is terrible, too. The fact that the CPSU Statutes and our party's program guidelines are not being fulfilled in a number of party organizations and the CPSU platform on the nationalities question and also many other Central Committee plenum decisions are not working. There is no monitoring, unfortunately, there is no exactingness. Calls to withdraw the party from the political arena and to consign to oblivion our fundamental teaching, Marxism-Leninism, are already being frankly voiced among a certain section of communists. Unfortunately, here we have no sense of an active position on the part of the CPSU Central Committee Secretariat and the CPSU Central Committee Politburo.

The deletion of Article 6 from the USSR Constitution should not be regarded as something tragic. It is true that our party's role and significance can be strengthened neither by decree nor by resolutions. Only an active position and a daily intensive and principled struggle by the CPSU and every member of it for the interests of the working people, the working class, the peasantry, and the labor intelligentsia and for the ideals of the international socialist movement can strengthen the party's prestige and role. In this regard the text of the amendments to Articles 6 and 7, which we have only just received, ought to provide a separate formula regarding the party. The party should be separated from the cooperatives and other social movements mentioned in this article. As a consequence of this the word "forcible" should also be removed from the phrase "forcible change."

Today the CPSU is directly accused of usurping power. But this is not so, comrades. Remember that the recently adopted CPSU Central Committee platform for our party's congress directly states that the CPSU does not lay claim to a monopoly, to an advantage, or to having its special status enshrined in the USSR Constitution. But this does not mean that the CPSU should quit the political arena and lay down the responsibility for the situation in the country and for the perestroyka which it itself initiated.

There is now no political force in the country capable of assuming responsibility for the consolidation of perestroyka's healthy forces and of playing the part of political vanguard, and no such force is likely to emerge in the immediate future. Everybody realizes that—both communists and nonparty people. We ought to take this seriously into account. It is our profound conviction that attempts to knock the helm of perestroyka and renewal out of the party's hands and attempts to resolve society's exacerbated problems without a renewed CPSU will lead only to still greater destabilization and will be a brake on perestroyka. This viewpoint is shared by the overwhelming majority of communists and nonparty people in our Kirghiz republic.

We have no objections so far as the date for the 28th CPSU Congress is concerned. Slight misgivings are prompted by something else: The possibility of holding the report and election campaign before the congress in an organized fashion and to high standards given the restricted time available. But the overwhelming majority of Kirghizia's communists believe that the campaign must indeed be held before the congress. In favor of this, regarding what Mikhail Sergeyevich has just said here, I would like to say the following: The recent elections to soviets of people's deputies highlighted the prestige of a number of leaders of party committees at various levels. Moreover, the more swiftly communists with voters' trust end up in elected party organs, the more swiftly the process of perestroyka will proceed in the party.

Nor are we entitled to disregard the fact that many primary party organizations are in fact advocating that the elections be held before the congress. Communists are unanimous that elections after the congress might be another loophole for those who intend to quietly sit things out and who certainly have nothing to report.

We believe—and this is the opinion of the overwhelming proportion of Kirghizia's communists—that the elections of the congress delegates should be direct, be secret, and offer multiple candidates. I think that given such an approach, the communists whose positions are near to the hearts of and understood by rank-and-file party members will be elected to the congress. But there is yet another reason. Communists really want to be firmly sure of the people who are going to determine the fate of the party, the country, and perestroyka. That is our opinion on the matter under discussion.

Esteemed Comrades! Now we need harmonious, cohesive work in the soviets, in the government, and in the Central Committee and local party organs and committees and a close link between the party and the people.

This is what can and must bring our party out onto the road of renewal. Thank you for your attention!

S.M. Bayzhanov (First Secretary of Dzhambul Kazakh Communist Party Obkom)

Comrades! The protracted debate over Article 6 of the USSR Constitution willy-nilly suggests the thought that many people perceive superficial rather than deep-seated processes in the prevailing political and socioeconomic situation in the country. Everybody knows that the constitutional enshrinement of the party's leading role in society has not made any substantive difference to the status quo and has not increased the party's prestige. The draft CPSU Central Committee platform for the 28th party congress also says this.

Indeed, Article 6 has existed for a little over 12 years, but Soviet power has existed for 72. Throughout this time the Communist Party has been in reality the leading and directing force of society. I am sure that most people, including those sitting here, did not even notice the new article of the Constitution which appeared in 1977 because party organs and their leaders had taken over the reins of government long before this.

However, the party became the linchpin of the administrative-edict system. Everything that was done was done in the name of the party. Now the party is answering for this to the people.

I want to go further in my arguments. Political parties have always been and are today the nucleus of particular political systems and expressers of the interests of certain strata or groups of the population. That is axiomatic. Thus the point is not Article 6, but the desire of opposition forces to squeeze the CPSU out of the ideological and political leadership of Soviet society. It is clear that at the present moment in society there is no real force except the CPSU that is capable of undertaking this mission, but clearly some people want first to create a vacuum and cut the party off from the people, so that they can operate in the requisite direction there.

I think that we, the present generation of communists, have no right to allow this, history will not forgive us such a mistake.

Many movements have emerged in the country, movements of the most diverse trends and complexions. Their aspirations, if their leaders' statements are to be believed, are aimed at building humane, democratic socialism. However, the surges of extremism and nationalism and the waves of strikes and rallies sweeping the country prompt the thought: Is this actually so? Certainly, no one will dispute the fact that in the present situation the only force capable of uniting healthy forces to some extent and coordinating actions to stabilize the economic situation and remove tension in the country is the CPSU—of course, only provided that it is fundamentally renewed.

Therefore we should not be perturbed now by the fate of Article 6. We should think more about how to accelerate the process of democratization within the party itself and how to ensure that it does not merely proclaim the vital interests of all social strata of the country's population but proves through its vigorous action that it is really expressing those interests. The fact that the party's potential is by no means exhausted is shown by its entire history, especially recently, when it has made bold, self-critical decisions, condemned the personality cult and the stagnation years, and been the initiator of perestroyka and of the transfer of full state power to the soviets.

So the party must seek to fully realize its primordial role as our society's vanguard and strategist, but without replacing or supplanting organs of state power.

The members of the bureau of our party obkom [oblast committee] and the party aktiv have had many meetings recently with cCommunists and nonparty people. I myself, as a participant in the Central Committee February Plenum, have had many such heated meetings. We have seen for ourselves once again that in the present complex situation most people believe in the party's creative force and hope that the draft constructive platform adopted by the CPSU Central Committee February (1990) Plenum can become the basis on which the party can gain a fitting place in the struggle for the renewal of socialism.

At the meetings communists and nonparty people are saying that the unjustified growth of the state bureaucratic apparatus, the all-embracing regulation of economic life, and the politicization of the economy have ultimately led to economic crisis.

It has to be said that people often blame local party organs for the bureaucratism of central departments and for the fact that the latter are restructuring themselves only poorly. Indeed, many ministries are quietly inflating their staff, keeping hold of all funds for fixed equipment and materials, distributing output, and failing to react to the needs of enterprises and the population. By various normatives they are nullifying the process of enterprises' transition to economic accountability. It is difficult to explain all this to labor collectives. Therefore we must accelerate the destruction of the administrative-edict system and the diktat of central departments that are refusing to take into account the specific nature of regions or to solve the problems of their comprehensive development. Without this it is impossible to really ensure the transfer of the full panoply of power to the soviets. This is also a condition for the party's influence on the masses, in Lenin's words, "not by force of power but by force of prestige, by force of energy, greater experience, greater versatility, and greater talent."

One last point. I support Comrade Prokofyev's point about the adoption of a law on parties. Thank you.

V.V. Bakatin (Member of the CPSU Central Committee and USSR Minister of Internal Affairs)

I, too, support Comrade Prokofyev's proposal regarding the adoption of a law on parties. But that is quite another matter. It is the law that will contain the mechanism for creation, dissolution, and spheres of activity. I am making another specific proposal. As well as amendments to Articles 6 and 7, there should be amendments to Article 51, which says that "citizens of the USSR have the right to unite in social organizations"; just add "have the right to unite in social and sociopolitical organizations." And the question will be removed.

Yu.I. Litvintsev (Member of the CPSU Central Committee and First Secretary of Tula CPSU Obkom)

We have abandoned the party's state power, setting this out in our program platform at the previous plenum. And accordingly this determined the raising today of the question of the fate of Article 6 of the USSR Constitution. I fully support the proposal on deleting the party's leading role in the political structure from the constitutional definition. We are thereby creating real possibilities for the perestroyka of the existing party-state system.

Now we have received and seen the draft of the way Articles 6 and 7 of the Constitution are to look and accordingly the way the party's role in society is to be defined.

Of course, there has been insufficient opportunity and time to profoundly analyze the new positions, but some things trouble me, and I would like to express my opinion about this. In my view, Article 6 in the form in which we read it today is in general directed toward the future. Maybe this is correct for the USSR Constitution. One day there will be many political parties. But, you will agree, today the Communist Party is a reality, is the political force consolidating society, and is the ruling party, even if we delete its leading role. Whether other parties or movements that have arisen will be in the same position that the CPSU finds itself in today is still uncertain. But we must clearly define the CPSU's place in our society today. The CPSU formulates policy and seeks its recognition by the people, and in this respect, in my view, it is substantially different from all the other social organizations and mass movements that you and I see in society today.

Therefore, I think that we should find a wording that nevertheless in our Constitution of our present society, our existing system, singles out the Communist Party as the political ruling force that formulates, I reiterate, its own policy. Of course, it must implement its policy as state policy via the communists elected to state and social organs and accordingly to local soviets. Otherwise it loses its point as a political ruling party.

If this article were worded thus, I think we would all—above all the communists whom we represent—somehow grasp and understand the changes under way in the party's position far more clearly.

A second point. Article 7 says that the creation and activity of parties, organizations, and movements directed toward the forcible overthrow of the existing social system are not permitted. I think that the word "forcible" is scarcely acceptable here. Forcible overthrow is a specific action. Everything is clear in this regard. It is a state of emergency. And it requires corresponding measures. But if a party or organization begins to seek to change our system via agitation, persuasion, and the shaping of public opinion, why should we tolerate this? After all, it is still intending to change the constitutional system. I think it would be more correct to say that parties with the aim of changing the Soviet constitutional system must not exist, and thereafter follow the text.

V.F. Yakovlev (USSR Minister of Justice)

In my view, Articles 6 and 7 cannot be retained in the form in which they now exist in the Constitution. But, in my view, we cannot simply delete the texts of these articles either, replacing them with nothing. Because we must clearly proceed all the same from today's realities. The deletion of these articles from the Constitution would mean that, first, we had not defined the place of social organizations, including of course parties, in our political system; and, second, we had simply yielded beneath the pressure of criticism in the mass media without formulating any positive position on this score. Therefore, I think it is correct to offer new versions of these articles nevertheless. These versions have been offered, and I think there is now some point in discussing them properly and formulating the most acceptable options.

In my view, the formulas we have just read are not entirely successful. I think they can be improved. I agree with some of the theses already voiced here. First, the Constitution must obviously enshrine provisions that citizens of the Soviet Union have the right to unite in various social organizations, including sociopolitical organizations, of course. Sociopolitical organizations are usually understood to mean parties, and also other organizations, including youth organizations, with a sociopolitical trend. That is the first point. Second, I think that the Constitution must without fail contain provisions regarding the fact that the activity of all social and sociopolitical organizations must be constitutional and accord with the laws operating in our society. I think that this is a valuable provision existing in our Constitution, a provision fully in line with the idea of the rule-of-law state on which we are working, and this provision should in no way be deleted from the Constitution and lost.

Further, in my view, the Constitution must without fail indicate the juridical, legal impediments to the registration of corresponding social organizations. I think that on the whole they are correctly formulated in the submitted version. Organizations professing violent methods of activity must be outlawed. Any form of violence, whatever it is directed against, is unacceptable,

contravenes the Constitution, and contravenes the law, including criminal legislation. Of course, these impediments should be formulated. In my view, the term "forcible" must feature here without fail. Otherwise the upshot will be that we are trying once again to use, so to speak, cunning juridical formulas to call into question the existence of social organizations professing views not entirely consonant with our own. I think that we must be extremely punctilious here in the present situation.

Furthermore, of course, I would delete cooperatives from these articles. Where do cooperatives come in here, comrades? I simply cannot understand how come cooperatives are mentioned here. Cooperatives are economic organizations, organizations for the production of goods and services. Generally speaking, they are organizations, let's see, engaging in business, production, and so forth. They are not social or sociopolitical organizations. The fact that certain cooperatives intend to engage in political activity beneath the guise of cooperative activity means that they are essentially no longer cooperatives. It does not mean that they should have their activity reinforced in the Constitution. Cooperatives should be deleted from Article 6, that is, they can be mentioned in the Constitution, but in quite another place. Where it speaks of ownership, including cooperative ownership, where it speaks of the diversity of economic activity. What have social and sociopolitical movements and organizations to do with this?

One last point. I think that this is an exceptionally important thesis. I think that the CPSU should not be placed in any special, exclusive position in comparison with other sociopolitical organizations. I realize that the comrades who are speaking are tormented, as we all are, by contradictions and doubts.

On the one hand, we are proceeding from the real role that the Communist Party has occupied and continues to occupy in our society, and, on the other, the fact that the Constitution of a state singles out a social organization, just one, and gives it in advance priority in the sphere of political life is certainly not very modern and civilized. So, on the one hand, this should not be done in the Constitution because in fact the Communist Party's role has been, is, and I think will continue to be determined not by what is written in the Constitution but by how far the party expresses the people's interests. If it continues to remain a party of the people expressing the interests, the genuine, true interests, of the working class, the peasantry, and what we call the labor intelligentsia, in other words, the interests of the people, then it will retain forever its special position among sociopolitical organizations and it will have no equals. But this must not be done via the Constitution. If we now try to leave these formulas in the Constitution, I think the party's prestige will suffer.

V.M. Mishin (Member of the CPSU Central Committee and Secretary of the AUCCTU)

I don't know about you, comrades, but today I, as a member of the party Central Committee elected by our party's 27th congress, do not feel that any great respect has been shown toward us, given that I have been forced today to mount this platform and speak out on a document that we received 10 or 15 minutes before the second session.

Now for the substance of the document. I think the wording "parties and other sociopolitical, trade union, and youth organizations and other social organizations," and thereafter according to the text, in principle merits support.

Today parties exist in real life in our country. I am not referring to the notorious "Democratic Union," which is shouting loudly and calling itself a party. For instance, I believe that "Sajudis" in Lithuania is a real political party with all the attributes and demonstrated this in the recent elections. So that there are no more breakaways, comrades, I would like to share a few more matters that deeply perturb me.

In my view, the party is now at a point beyond which a grim future looms. According to the estimates of the sociologists of the Academy of Social Sciences, for the first time in our society the percentage of people believing in the CPSU's progressive role is smaller than the proportion convinced of the reverse.

In my view, this is a quantitative measure of the crisis of confidence in our party. Whether we will be able to overcome this trend—the decline in the party's prestige among the broad masses—is by no means a rhetorical question. It is a question of the life and death of the CPSU and maybe of all Soviet society.

Its resolution, in my view, depends to the greatest extent on two factors.

First. The extent to which the party's program documents—I am referring both to the platform and to the statutes—accord with the nature of our society's democratic development, reflect the people's interests, and are attractive to young people.

Second, the attractiveness of the personalities of the political leaders who personify the party in the consciousness of the masses.

I am not going to say any more. I will submit my remarks about the statutes in written form. But I would like to dwell briefly on the second aspect and to speak out before my comrades on the Central Committee.

It is well known that the more insistently our leaders deny the talk and rumors of disagreements in the Politburo in their speeches, the more persistent the rumors become. As an extreme example, I will cite the statement of the well known writer Anatoliy Pristavkin in a recent interview. I quote: "The CPSU did not initiate perestroyka. One man initiated it—Gorbachev. He initiated it despite the party and he is continuing with it despite the party. Moreover, all the five years of perestroyka have shown that the CPSU is the main brake on it." I would add to that opinion the comment that I have also

encountered, indeed I think we all have, far more unparliamentary expressions regarding this. Take, for instance, the two February rallies in Moscow. Of course, you can close your eyes to this circumstance, which I do not think is very flattering to Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev himself, you can put it down to insinuations by our political opponents. But I think it is more useful for the party to see this as a serious warning and to recognize the objective grounds for the spread of such opinions.

Sometimes you hear the explanation that the other Politburo members speak more rarely and so their role in the processes of renewal is not so noticeable. In my view, it is impossible to agree entirely with this. Moreover, the more often Yegor Kuzmich Ligachev, say, addresses a broad audience, the more clearly his name is linked with the concepts of "conservative party forces," the "right wing," and "opponents of democratic change."

It is well known that Yegor Kuzmich himself disagrees with this. He will certainly say today that I am wrong. Fine, I would in no way like to ascribe alien aspirations to him. Comrade Ligachev's services to the party are well known, they are recognized and no one disputes them. In particular, no difference of opinions can shake my conviction of his personal honesty and principledness, and, together with you, I have done what I can to defend his dignity as a leader, a communist, and a citizen from unsubstantiated slander.

At the same time I want to note that the image of a political leader is formed and changes not all of a sudden, but under the influence of a great variety of circumstances which often take no account of the will and wishes of the person himself. The image of Ligachev the politician did not take shape only yesterday. He is characterized by traits such as directness, resolution, persistence and purposefulness, and a conviction of his own rightness. Until recently these qualities were regarded as the exclusive merit of a true party member and helped the party to emerge from the quagmire of stagnation, which had bred servility, facelessness, and a timeserving attitude toward the leadership.

But now times are changing. Life is dictating new demands to party leaders: The ability to heed and analyze a mass of the most contradictory opinions, to seek a consensus without losing your chosen bearings, and to persuade people by the logic of your thought, not only the firmness of your character, by your competence as a professional, rather than by a commissar's hectoring.

Can Ligachev the politician change cardinally today? I think only at the price of destroying his own integral personality. Do Ligachev the communist and the party need this today? I think not. Is he useful to the party in his former capacity? Again, I think not. In the prevailing situation I am not submitting a proposal to raise the question of releasing Yegor Kuzmich Ligachev from his duties as secretary of the CPSU Central Committee. No. I am taking advantage of my right as a comrade in the party and in the Central Committee to ask Yegor Kuzmich once again to carefully weigh all the circumstances, the political situation in the country and in the party, and voluntarily resign, either in order to take up some other job or to enjoy a well deserved rest.

I think that by taking such a step Yegor Kuzmich can help the party, especially at this extremely complex period of preparation for the scheduled 28th—but essentially extraordinary—party congress....

Comrades, please let me finish. Resignation is not a tragedy, not a defeat. It is a conscious step by someone who has done his job and played his role. It must become, and I am sure it will become, a norm in our political life. It is better to resign on the basis of comradely advice than under the pressure of mass rallies making categorical demands, as is unfortunately happening in certain oblast centers.

Comrades, I am making this proposal merely as food for thought, and Yegor Kuzmich Ligachev has already earned his place in our country's political history. Thank you.

V.I. Brovikov (Member of the CPSU Central Committee and USSR Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to the Republic of Poland)

Comrades, I long hesitated over whether I should speak today after the speech I made in February. Nonetheless, during the course of the debate concern at the party's fate is forcing me to take part in this discussion. The 27th CPSU Congress was held four years ago. It subjected the past to rigorous critical analysis and elaborated historically important tasks that were optimistic and at the same time realistic. But, comrades, let's return to the congress. Let's compare its decisions against the actual situation in the country. We will easily see that we have turned aside from the path outlined by the congress and have not obtained the results that we then incorporated in our plans. Sorry if I am exaggerating anything, but that is sometimes necessary in order to arrive at the midpoint of the truth. Instead of an acceleration of socioeconomic development (and it is precisely this that was the quintessence of the congress), it is slowing down. Instead of the living conditions of working people rising, they are declining. Instead of a reform of the system of state and economic management, in many respects it is being deformed. Finally, instead of the party being strengthened, a line of weakening and discrediting it is being pursued. It is being pursued by various forces: Both opposition forces and forces inside our party.

How is all this to be understood, comrades? Was the congress wrong in its assessments and aims, or has the Central Committee, have we all, taken together, proved unequal to the task? Sad to say, we must admit the latter. The Central Committee, above all its Politburo and Secretariat, have failed to bolster the course adopted by the congress with proper organizational and political work. I see this as one of the explanations of the decline

in our party's prestige since the 27th congress. Incidentally, a similar fate has befallen many Central Committee plenum decisions, which were also left or have been left hanging in the air. In short, all our reforming head of steam is being used on the whistle, on slogans and endless debates in this auditorium and associated ones.

The party itself has found itself in an extremely grave situation, and we all realize this. It is being reviled in the most outrageous of terms. This is being done, as you know, not directly but indirectly, via criticism of the partocracy, administrative-edict methods, and the like. There is no question: The party deserves criticism, there is much in the party that needs to be changed substantially, and maybe even radically. A section of the party apparatus and many Communists who have distorted the party line or who have become degenerates deserve criticism. However, it is necessary—we must do this—to distinguish who is voicing the criticism, and for what purpose. If the criticism comes from honest people, that is one thing, but if it comes from various political chameleons taking refuge behind Leninist phraseology, that is something else again. That is dangerous. But even that is not the trouble. The discordant chorus of homegrown carping critics evokes a sinister, harsh echo in the West. Reactionaries of every stripe are cursing communists for all they are worth and are singing a requiem for the CPSU, Leninism, and socialism at the top of their voices. What is most annoying of all is the fact that nobody at the top—neither the general secretary nor his closest associates—has taken substantial measures to defend the party's honor and dignity. Either because this suits them, or because they themselves are afraid of criticism from the "critics."

You can all see, comrades, what is the result of this—disorientation not only in the party, but also in society. People do not understand what is happening. At the end of the ninth decade of its history the CPSU, which unites almost 19 million people (one in 10 citizens of the country), is faced with the greatest danger ever. Attempts are increasingly being made to shove it to the margins of political life and to turn it from a ruling party into a debating club or, at best, a player in a parliamentary game. To allow this to happen would be, in my view, a catastrophe for the country since no other integrating force, no other guarantor of the immutability of the foundations of socialism exists or can exist in our country.

Unfortunately, not everyone in the Politburo shares that view. You get the impression that our leaders are hastening to write the party off as society's leading force and to transfer to the president the functions of the eliminated Politburo. But why the hurry? We were in a hurry in a similar instance once before, when we allowed ourselves at the party conference to be talked into introducing the post of chairman of the Supreme Soviet and into combining the two main posts in the party and the state. Remember how our leadership and the same legal academics were just as enthusiastic then as they are now in persuading everyone that this is the latest achievement in the theory of not only state but also party building and that this would still further strengthen the CPSU's role.

Okay, we agreed back then, we changed the Constitution. We worked for a year—and then what? Apparently we hadn't thought things out. At the very least, we hadn't thought them right out. But for some reason I haven't heard the authors and propagandists of this idea admit this. They can't be bothered to do so. A new idea has occurred to them. They are pressuring deputies and public opinion even more than before.

But, comrades, what guarantee is there that presidential power will save us from the calamities that have befallen us? I think society has more doubts than hopes on this score.

Anyhow, this is too serious a matter for us to decide it in a rush, without properly consulting the people. I fully share the opinion of those who advocate a referendum. Please tell me what we are supposed to submit to the verdict of the whole people if not an issue like a fundamental change in the form of state rule?

Now I would like to present a few more points to the Central Committee. I stress that these are my own views, for I am speaking here as a communist and a Central Committee member solely in my own name.

I have already said that, in my opinion, the Central Committee and its Politburo should bear responsibility for the failure of the decisions of the 27th congress. Local party organs should also be implicated here. But if we are to follow Leninist principles, our decisions are collegial, but responsibility is personal. Incidentally, this also features in the draft of the new statutes, which we are going to discuss at the next session. So I believe that not only Comrade Ligachev, who has been named here, but also Comrades Gorbachev, Medvedev, Slyunkov, Yakovlev, and Medvedev must personally answer for the crisis in the country and the party. It seems to me that they have not entirely vindicated the trust that was shown in them and have not entirely coped with the sectors of work entrusted to them.

Comrades! I don't think we will find the way out of the present situation by adopting half-hearted measures. We must think out radical measures and use the time remaining before the congress in order to rouse the party despite everything, to raise its prestige, and to strengthen the party and emerge from the congress with a strong party.

I realize it is not easy to take these measures. Previously such measures have always been taken only on initiative from the top, but the logic of the development of the internal political situation dictates the need for such methods to us. Either the Central Committee will display determination, or we will be left at the mercy of the elements and will continue our often useless improvisations. We have certainly had enough of trial and error.

The country needs a scientifically substantiated program of reforms in all spheres of material and spiritual life, profound, consistent reforms geared to success both in the remote future and today. I think that the 28th congress of our Leninist party should elaborate such a program.

M.S. Gorbachev: Just a minute, what are your specific proposals? This is your second speech, you have made very serious accusations....

V.I. Brovikov: No, not accusations, Mikhail Sergeyevich.

M.S. Gorbachev: We have turned aside from the course, we must bear responsibility.... What are your specific proposals?

V.I. Brovikov: I believe, Mikhail Sergeyevich, that it would be useful if the Politburo members were to report, each regarding his area of competence, on the failures since the 27th congress.

M.S. Gorbachev: Is that all?

V.I. Brovikov: That may be all, but it's plenty.

V.N. Shved (Second Secretary of the provisional Central Committee of the Lithuanian Communist Party [on the CPSU Platform])

Comrades! I had not planned to speak, but unfortunately the situation forces me to. We have been working for three months in conditions where Article 6 of the Constitution has been abolished. Certainly no one doubts the need to amend Article 6. This is overdue, and Comrade Yakovlev was indeed right when he said that the party's role and prestige in society are determined by people's trust. But that is true only in the event that a majority of people who today carry party cards remain communists not only in terms of party cards but also in terms of ideas.

Unfortunately, today we quite often come up against a system where, once the article is abolished, people with party cards instantly forget these ideas and begin to preach totally different ones. In this situation the CPSU remains practically helpless and unprotected in the legal respect. Yet the CPSU is (I don't think it is worth repeating this truth, but maybe it is!) the political and ideological linchpin of our entire system. When communists are legally helpless in the face of advancing events, matters often reach the point of the most serious collisions in society itself.

It was said today that in Lithuania "Sajudis" has proved its right to leadership. Yes, indeed, the results of the elections to the republic's Supreme Soviet showed that the Lithuanian Communist Party (on the CPSU platform) gained only four seats. At this point I must say that no representatives of the Russian-speaking urban population got into parliament at all. The point is not so much the prestige of the CPSU or of the reorganized Lithuanian Communist Party, the point is that the non-Lithuanian-speaking population in the republic is today demoralized.

"Sajudis" has done a great deal. It has been able to rouse and rally the Lithuanian people. It set them a goal, and the whole indigenous population voted, which cannot be said for the others. I don't want to set Lithuanians at loggerheads with Russians. Today the problem is that some residents of Lithuania have lost their future and confidence in their future and did not vote. While the people who today see that future as lying in independence did go to vote. And we communists do not always see that future and succeed in conveying it to the masses.

However, in this situation things are by no means as brilliant for our opponents as they would like. Unfortunately, I do not have the results of the elections for 7-8 March, but the 116 Lithuanian SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] deputies (out of 141) elected in the first and second rounds received only 36.7 percent of the votes of all voters in the republic. Supporters of "Sajudis," who constituted 89 of the 116 deputies, mustered—how many do you think?—28.3 percent of the votes of all voters. As of today 131 deputies have been elected, but this will scarcely add more than eight or 10 percent to the existing figures. There's a mandate from the nation for you! But nevertheless, the "continuation" of the 1938 republic with all ensuing consequences will be announced today in the name of all residents of Lithuania.

I must also note that, despite the election defeat, we represent a considerable proportion of the republic's population. Some support us openly, others do so covertly, but how can be realize this trust on the part of the population? In what way? It transpires that in legal terms we haven't got a leg to stand on.

You know that a Central Committee group visited the republic and helped us to decide questions, including with regard to the division of property. We are grateful. Oral agreement was reached that we would resolve all questions amicably, as is customary in the civilized world. But once the commission left, everything changed. This forced our Central Committee Bureau to adopt a resolution asking the CPSU Central Committee, on the basis of USSR and Lithuanian SSR legislation on ownership, to immediately adopt relevant documents enshrining the right of the Lithuanian Communist Party (on the CPSU platform) to possess and use certain CPSU-owned facilities on the territory of Lithuania.

This is not a cry for help or evidence of our helplessness but a request to resolve questions of defending communists' interests at a legal level. I want to cite one illustration for the sake of clarity. In the city of Klaypeda there are 6,300 communists on the CPSU platform and 3,000 members of the reorganized Communist Party. Nevertheless, all prerogatives of party power and all the appurtenances, so to speak, belong to the reorganized

party or, more accurately, to its apparatus. Matters have reached the point where our elected gorkom [city committee] secretary was not even allowed into the office of the first secretary. We have nothing to say to them, they maintained. So we believe that in a rule-of-law state there should be a law regulating the legal status of the CPSU and its property rights. Unfortunately, there is a danger that this situation may recur not only in Klaypeda but somewhere else, too. Today, when we are raising the question of amending Article 6 of the Constitution, I would like this proposal to be supported—that on the need for a law on parties in which the reality, the CPSU, should be recognized and its legal protection thought through. Otherwise, to be honest, we will have to run up against the most serious problems in ensuring the party's activity. Please do not understand my proposal as the creation of some special status for the CPSU. No! But the realities of life demand that communists' rights be protected by law in this complex period.

I.T. Frolov (Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and Chief Editor of PRAVDA)

Esteemed Comrades! I think that the fact that the question of Articles 6 and 7 and mostly of Article 6 of the USSR Constitution has been raised now and raised on the Central Committee's initiative is very important. We are told that we are apparently being led by the nose by someone, that we are being pushed into adopting this decision, and so forth. But that is absolutely untrue. I must say that the idea of reformulating Article 6 arose a very long time ago inside the Central Committee, in the Central Committee Politburo, and the question was only how to make the changes, in what forms, and at what stage. You know that hitherto we have all upheld the following position: It is advisable to make these amendments while adopting a new USSR Constitution. Please tell me, is this a clear position? Yes, it is. I think that this also shows a certain responsibility on the part of the Central Committee, a responsibility on the part of the Politburo and all who have espoused this position. Why? Because we see this act as the natural result of the change in our political system. I would venture to invite us all to reflect in precisely this vein, rather than explaining who was the first to say something, and so forth.

We are told nowadays that the party is lagging behind the transformations taking place in society. Someone, it is claimed, personally initiated perestroyka and is heading it, and so forth. Why can Central Committee members not have a clear, precise, and firm understanding that this was simply impossible—beginning transformations and initiating perestroyka in this way?

That also applies to the constitutional amendments that are under discussion. At the start of perestroyka we had absolutely no changes in the political system. The new corps of deputies had not yet been created in our country, the new Supreme Soviet did not exist. We are still only beginning the second stage of the political reform. Therefore, the Central Committee and the Central Committee Politburo, so far as I can see, were in no hurry to submit these proposals. But now the necessary conditions have been created for this, so I venture to claim that yes, indeed, we are now naturally submitting these proposals to the Congress of USSR People's Deputies and we are not late in doing so.

Allow me to dwell on one more point. I do not think that we are now going to intimidate one another with the experience of the East European countries and so forth. I regard this as baseless because everything that has begun in our country did indeed begin in our country. I am referring to the processes of perestroyka, which did not develop under the pressure of any external forces. We are traveling our own characteristic path. We are also taking into account what is going on, including in the East European countries, but this cannot be regarded as a factor that is inducing us to act.

There is something else I would like to mention. I can say this because I have been a member of the Central Committee since the 27th party congress, in other words, I entered the political arena during the years of perestroyka. I can say that yes, four years have indeed passed, it will not be long before this Central Committee, too, will disappear and be reelected. But it is necessary to go with dignity, Comrades. Do you understand? It is necessary to go with dignity. Why have I mentioned this here? Because there is something I want to ask some people, including those who have spoken today, Comrade Mishin, for instance. Where did you spring from? What, do you imagine people do not know you? Or know you only as a member of this convocation of the Central Committee? What did you say, what did you do at previous stages? Now you have the presumption, so to speak, to lecture many Central Committee members, myself included? Why? I have nothing to do with what you did before the 27th congress. The same also goes for Comrade Brovikov, who clearly desperately wants to whitewash his own conscience (I don't know why) and systematically makes allegations that clearly must be concealing something. Exactly what I do not know. So far as I am aware, before the 27th party congress Comrade Brovikov worked in the Central Committee Organizational Party Work Department. So he, too, should engage in self-criticism.

One more point, then I will finish. It has been said here that it is during the years of perestroyka that the party's prestige has declined and is declining. That is a lie. If you address a lay audience you will be told: The party's prestige began to fall during what we call the years of stagnation, when the party decayed and was literally corrupted. That is the source of the decline in the party's prestige! If accusations are now being made against the party, people are remembering the repressions and crimes of Stalinism and the corruption, bribery, and moral decay of previous years. Can all this be compared to what has happened during the years of perestroyka? Can this be ranked even close to what I have listed? No, and that is the whole point. It seems to me that that is how people who have come "from there," from the

pre-perestroyka times, raise and formulate the question, and they do so in order to whitewash their own conscience.

Finally, the very last point. Of course, what we are discussing today is only formally designated as an amendment, so to speak, to Articles 6 and 7 of our country's Constitution. In fact (and this yet again shows why this had to be done during the concluding stages of the political reform), Comrades, this is a revolution in the literal sense of the word, the culmination, the total culmination of the change in the political system. Why? The draft CPSU Central Committee platform says of this: How can the system that existed in our country hitherto be defined? As a party-state system in which the party was organically built into the system of state and other management. We have now created everything connected with legislative organs. We have now redefined the role and functions of the government, and so forth. We are discussing changes in the party's functions. So we must realize how they will change. If we now abandon the formulas offered in Article 6 of the Constitution, the question immediately arises: What kind of party? That is the question we must discuss today.

What kind of party in the new conditions? In answering this question, we inevitably arrive at the fact that the party is chiefly an ideological and political force. Not a management link in the system of the economy or somewhere else, but precisely an ideological and political force. I think that is precisely how each communist should now view himself, rather than wallowing in nostalgia for former times and remembering some kind of leading role of the party, and so forth. The party's role, including its vanguard role, I would say, will certainly strengthen still further if we place the emphasis on precisely this—on the party as an ideological and political force. But for this we need different people, different cadres who have not sprung from somewhere in the past and who are not now making such an undignified departure.

Of course, the wording of Articles 6 and 7 of the Constitution that has been proposed to us still requires clarification. Maybe for some people, I don't know whether the criticism is relevant or not, for some people it may have been too hasty—the way it was handed out just 15 minutes before the debate, and so on. But we have long been discussing all this. All of us in the Central Committee have thought about this. So I think we should take the proposed wording as our basis, but correct a few things about it. For instance, I personally believed—and I said this when the wording was being discussed—that maybe we should not list trade union organizations, still less cooperative organizations, and so forth, but should simply say: "Sociopolitical and mass organizations." I think we can submit Article 6 of the Constitution in that wording to the Congress of People's Deputies that opens tomorrow. Thank you.

V.I. Mironenko (Member of the CPSU Central Committee, First Secretary of the All-Union Lenin Komsomol [Communist Youth League] Central Committee)

Esteemed comrade Central Committee members! If you remember, back in December, when we were discussing questions of the forthcoming Second Congress of People's Deputies, I asked—perhaps too insistently—to be granted the floor. I asked for the floor in order to say that our conversations with young people have shown that the party's prestige is suffering because we are clinging to legal guarantees. The vast majority of young people do not accept any postponement of a decision on the point that the party's right to be the political vanguard should not be legally enshrined in the state's Fundamental Law. Although a significant proportion of young people are prepared to support party policy.

I would like to say today, now that this question has, after all, entered the practical realm, that I fully support the view that it is necessary to submit to the next Congress of People's Deputies—and specifically on the initiative of the CPSU Central Committee—a proposal on revising those articles. I would like to support Comrade Bakatin with regard to Article 51. The party can only rule when it is correctly expressing what the people feel. I do not think any of us here today is likely to say that the people do not recognize the need to remove the legal guarantees of the party's real struggle for its vanguard political role in the resolution of all the problems that have been discussed today.

I realize that a great many bitter truths have indeed been spoken from this platform today. Of course, every one of us, including me as a Central Committee member, all the Central Committee members, and the Politburo members, will have to answer—and, firstly, to answer at the forthcoming 28th CPSU Congress—for what he has done and not done. But since we have, after all, decided that power should belong to the soviets, let us be consistent. I have always regarded it as the distinguishing feature of a communist that communists never laid claim to political power in perpetuity, but stated from the outset that they would take such power only in order to hand it over to the people. And after handing it over, to defend it against political intriguers and adventurists. But defending it is only possible if power is handed over to the soviets of people's deputies and the party takes its place among the social organizations, albeit as a mighty, strong sociopolitical organization capable of protecting the people's power against all encroachments.

I am in favor of submitting this proposal in the name of the CPSU Central Committee, adding an amendment to Article 51, and ensuring that Articles 6 and 7 consistently express the desire of the CPSU Central Committee to renounce the legal formulation of the party's vanguard role in the Constitution. Thank you!

[Text]

V.M. Semenov (First Secretary of Grodno Belorussian Communist Party Obkom) Comrades! The discussion of the question of whether or not to submit to the Congress of People's Deputies a proposal on amending Articles 6, 7, and 51 of the Constitution would not in itself, in my opinion, give rise to the need to engage in debates at the present plenum. We are more than ready for it, and, furthermore, we have already suffered more than enough for holding onto this article. The blame, unfortunately, today, Mikhail Sergeyevich and esteemed Politburo members, rests not with the Politburo, and not even with the Central Committee, but with us, the leaders of the party's structural components. As if we were holding onto it and it is helping us in some way.

We are talking about a fusion of party and state structures. But this is happening only at the highest level of party and state administration, at the level of the CPSU Central Committee, the Council of Ministers, and the Supreme Soviet. When you come down to oblast level and below, then, whatever we like to think, even if we write four new articles, we do not have this power, either material or financial. In fact, they have made us the culprits. This is indicated not only by the results of the first, second, and third elections, but also by the attitude to party leaders as conservatives who hold on to what they should not hold on to. In fact, we implement the decisions that are adopted here in this auditorium and in the auditorium where the Politburo meets. We implement all these decisions with a clear conscience and consciously. So if the decisions are wrong, we too are to blame. But if incorrect decisions are taken and we are instructed to fulfill them, then those who lead us should take the responsibility. Not for nothing is there a saying that we would work better if we had better leadership. And this applies to us when we make demands on our subordinates. Today we explain that political reform is lagging behind economic reforms. But meanwhile communists are saying to us: If we pursue political reforms as rapidly as economic reforms and with as little forethought, we will taste even more sorrow than today.

In recent years, since 1985, virtually no joint resolution of the party and state administration in the economic sphere has produced positive results. Today people are calling us to account: Why did we punish some people for weakness in combating drunkenness and alcohol production, why did we not increase the pace sufficiently and knock the economic leaders' blocks off for failing to promise to do the impossible; why are we today having to answer to people for a bad decision concerning the appointment of leaders by election, the loss of governability, and the faulty laws on the Soviet cooperative system, instead of the originators of these laws having to answer for them? Not a single law has worked.

This is not the first time I have participated in Central Committee plenums as a guest. At last I have the opportunity to speak. As a people's deputy I have not once been given the floor at a session, not once have I been given the floor at the congress. Eight memorandums, and not a single reply, not so much as an acknowledgement. I have written and said: Mikhail Sergeyevich, Anatoliy Ivanovich, do not announce me as an obkom first secretary, just put: Member of the Planning, Budget, and Finance Commission. Perhaps then there would be no shame in my speaking. Is that right, Anatoliy Ivanovich?

I use the new parliamentary forms—"Please read out my memorandum," "Please note, I request such-and-such...." Even the Supreme Soviet fear us party workers like lepers now. What are we doing about it? Because we never speak out frankly, we are afraid that there will be consequences of some kind. We go on asserting that we have democratization in society and democracy in the party.

Comrades! Mikhail Sergeyevich, I have a request for you in particular. If I failed, at an obkom plenum, to respond to even one memorandum from a plenum participant, the question of no confidence in the first secretary would be raised. I have submitted memorandums time and again, including some concerning our platform and our statutes. I wanted a reply, not for myself, but for the communists. I have not received a reply, either oral or written, to a single memorandum. We are too busy, leave us alone, send it to some Central Committee department or other, argue it out with them—and so I have to go and tell people yes, I really did submit your questions to the Central Committee, but they did not really want to answer. I cannot do that.

The next question. I know there is no need to speak on the subject of today's report, but I believe that with this report it will be even harder for us now to carry out work on the discussion of the draft statutes, which, incidentally, is overdue, it should have been given to us together with the draft platform, whereas now we can argue that the Democratic Platform was created earlier and that it is "smarter" and more progressive. Not true. Once again, questions from communsits in our army, the KGB, and the Ministry of Internal Affairs [MVD] remain unanswered: What will become of their party structure? What are we doing? At the enterprises people have been reluctant to pay their dues for a long time, and they cite Central Committee decisions. Everywhere, constantly, party buildings are being handed over, as if we had not adopted the Law on Ownership in the Supreme Soviet. This is our property, and it is time we stopped simply handing it over free, even if it is a question of hospitals. We should sell what was built out of party dues, sell it to the local soviets, and they can do what they like with it.

A question of principle which I still cannot answer and which I "fudge" when I meet with communists: Comrades, what kind of party do we need, will it still be a Communist Party, or do we pack our bags and go off and join the social democrats? We cannot answer this question, because we have not said frankly to all the country's communists: What kind of society do we intend to build? If we intend to build a bourgeois capitalist society, our party today—the CPSU—should be an opposition party; if we intend to build a socialist society, the party should be the vanguard. If it is a question of a transitional

period, as they graciously promise us at rallies in Moscow, and even in Minsk and Grodno now, then the place of a parliamentary party is—go on, keep moving, make a fuss, and then everything will become clear.

On the presidential system. Comrades, why could we not be the first to hear and discuss these matters, in our broad party circles? Why does the general secretary submit these matters first of all for discussion with the deputies, and then we have to meet and decide "off the cuff" and "on the spur of the moment:" Should we have a president today, or not? Yes, I am in favor of a presidency. True, the title itself is unfamiliar in general, for Russia and for the whole country. Communists have said to me: It would be better to elect an emperor, it would be nearer the mark.... But comrades, joking apart, what will happen next? Today, once again, we are only worrying about how to form the administrative system at the top. What happens down below? We are writing it into the draft law that we will have chairmen of union republic Supreme Soviets. But people ask us—why not a president there, too? And what about at oblast level? At rayon level? Can I combine the position of first secretary with the post of oblast soviet chairman, which means returning to the system of provincial governors? We ought to think the whole thing through. In some places the elections will finish today or tomorrow. Today we do not know who will be forming the soviet power, and how.

On the reports and elections. Mikhail Sergeyevich, you were wrong when you said in the report that at the last plenum everyone was unanimous on their timing. Two people taking part in the plenum came out in favor of holding them before the congress. Not because we are afraid of no confidence votes, and so forth. I was elected to the Supreme Soviet and as first secretary on a contested basis. It was the kind of contest that I would not wish on anyone else. That is not what we are afraid of. We are afraid of messing up the most important thing—the holding of report meetings and the formation of party organs. After all, we will be busy almost until mid-May with elections to the local soviets. We are allowed time to begin the report and election campaign only from 1 April, and we must complete it in the oblasts by 10 May. Today we do not even know how to form the okrugs, but if it is necessary to act quickly, I would like to make a concrete proposal—allow us to hold whatever kind of report and election campaign we want: A full campaign, or not. Most importantly, do not steer us and blinker us with the existing instructions and the present party statutes.

Just say: Within the framework of the draft statutes and the platform, do what you like. The main thing is—elect the 28th congress delegates in the right way. Forgive me for overstepping the standing orders.

S.S. Shatalin (Academician, Acting Academician Secretary of the USSR Academy of Sciences Economics Department)

Comrades, I would not have spoken if it were only a question of amendments to Articles 6 and 7 of the USSR Constitution. In principle I support the proposal on this question, but I will say that it is necessary to be more precise and say that it should not only be a question of the CPSU and other sociopolitical organizations, but of other political parties. I also agree with the proposal from Comrade Bakatin and, apparently, Comrade Prokofyev on Article 51.

Now my second point. A bit of a debate has broken out here, so I will say a couple of words too. After my speech at the February plenum people started accusing me of being a social democrat. I said then and I will say now, because I do not change my convictions from one day to the next, that I support social democratic positions now, too. And I have no wish to change.

But I was never and never will be one of those people who flee the CPSU at the most difficult time, and I would like everyone to be absolutely clear about that. I have not lived my life in order to leave the CPSU just like that, willy-nilly, as has been said here, slamming the door behind me or not. I personally do not want to slam any doors, and I will not leave the CPSU. It is another matter, and I think you, as my party comrades, will support me here, that I will, of course, strive to urge the party leadership and the party to adopt those ideas that I, as a party member, prefer. I do not think I will be hindering the party by doing this. On the contrary. If we are all identical, we will simply die the death politically, because for political movements, uniformity and death are one and the same thing.

Now another matter. This is what I would like to say, comrades. You know, this constitutional protection of the party will do us a great deal of damage again in future. Unless we submit amendments to Articles 6 and 7 of the Constitution to the Congress of People's Deputies on behalf of the party, as we agreed in the Platform, we will once again, for the umpteenth time, be accused of being deceptive and failing to fulfill our own decisions. I see nothing terrible, absolutely nothing, in having no legal backing for the word "leading," and so forth.

But if one person is stronger than another, why should he not lead? Only you have to prove that you are the stronger! People here have said: The CPSU is the only party, the only force, and so forth. Comrades, perhaps that is true, it probably is, but this political sangfroid, as I have said before, is out of place. Why are we praising ourselves? Let other people praise us and say that there was, is, and will be no stronger or better party than the Communist Party. That would be more honest, more correct. We should engage in calm, frank dialogue with the people and not be afraid of such things, otherwise people will start saying: You are playing with the black chessmen. As an old sportsman, if you will allow me, I will say that not even Garri Kasparov, despite his genius rating, could win a strong tournament if he was playing with the black pieces. So let us play with the white pieces. Let us be the ones always to make the first move, let others respond to us! Why should we give up the right to make the first move? True, white is a bad color [because

white is the color of counterrevolution], I agree, but in chess the colors are white and black, like it or not!

And another thing. You know, perhaps I am wrong about the army, the KGB, and the MVD. Do they necessarily need political directorates and so forth—please understand me correctly, I really do not know, do they need them? I don't know.

If we communists have ourselves recognized a multiparty system, then other parties could join in the struggle. Well, what of it? Let us struggle. I am sure we will win, because we already have experience, we have strength, we have intelligent people. We are no more stupid than other sociopolitical organizations. So let us work on that assumption. Why should we necessarily lose to anyone else? I do not think that need necessarily happen.

One last thing. I think that unless we adopt the amendments to these articles now, the question of the presidency could be resolved negatively tomorrow or the next day. Why give additional trump cards to people so that we can spend another two days engaged in a terribly uncivilized debate about whether we need a president or not? If we keep on giving ourselves problems like that for two days at a time, we will find it is five years before we can elect a president. That is no way to go on. Are we coming out against that too now? Although, of course, everything must be done exclusively within the law. So, in making the decision on these points, we must without fail take account of the fact that tomorrow sees the start of the Congress of People's Deputies, where we must be victorious, because the people simply will not forgive us a defeat. Forgive me for taking up your time.

V.A. Koptyug (Member of the CPSU Central Committee, Vice President of the USSR Academy of Sciences, Chairman of the Electoral Commission)

You will remember that in connection with Comrade Abalkin's election as deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers a vacancy arose for a people's deputy from the CPSU. Today, in accordance with the Law on Elections of People's Deputies, we have to conduct elections for a USSR deputy from the CPSU, to fill this vacancy.

On 9 December 1989 the Central Committee Plenum nominated as candidate USSR people's deputies from the CPSU Comrade Pavel Andreyevich Abrosov, fitter at the Moscow Automated Production Lines Plant named for the 50th Anniversary of the USSR; Comrade Nikolay Petrovich Kustarev, smith at the Gorkiy Truck Plant; and Comrade Aleksey Petrovich Shustov, electric equipment fitter at Moscow's "Stankokonstruktsiya" Plant.

The electoral commission, having examined the resolution of the Central Committee December Plenum as well as the statements of the nominated comrades agreeing to run as candidate USSR people's deputies from the CPSU, found that the nomination of candidates was fully in accordance with the Law on Elections of USSR People's Deputies.

The commission registered the nominated candidates in accordance with the schedule laid down by the law and published an announcement to that effect in the party press. On the submission of the candidate deputies, their agents were registered in good time. In December of last year and January and February of this year, in accordance with the Law on Elections, our candidate people's deputies held meetings with labor collectives, communists, and the public. In all there were 36 such meetings. More than 5,000 people took part, and more than 180 spoke.

All the meetings were characterized by an atmosphere of openness, goodwill, and a committed, constructive exchange of opinions. The speakers mainly supported our candidate people's deputies and characterized them as energetic people thinking in the modern way, capable of working actively on the country's highest organ of state power to uphold the interests of the party and people and the ideals of perestroyka in our country.

The question of increasing the party's prestige was discussed at the meetings. There ws talk of the important role that USSR people's deputies from the CPSU should play here. It was noted, in particular, that our envoys are not sufficiently active at congresses and sessions, which is clearly the fault, to some degree, of the CPSU Central Committee leadership, which should do more to help organize their work.

At recent meetings attention was focused on the draft CPSU Central Committee Platform for the 28th Party Congress and on preparations for the congress itself. The communists, while supporting the draft on the whole, expressed the view that it should be made more relevant and should answer the main questions that concern people now—the state of the economy, law and order, the evaluation of sociopolitical trends and moods. There was talk of ensuring effective economic accountability and self-financing for enterprises, increasing consumer goods production, and eliminating shortages. Many participants in the meetings see the main way of resolving the food problem in the development of the material base and the social sphere in the countryside. Speakers proposed ways of resolving a number of ecological problems.

Along with the desire for the further widening of glasnost in the activity of the party and of state organs, the demand was often put forward for grater objectivity and balance in various publications and an increase in the responsibility of mass media leaders for the truthfulness and authenticity of publications.

During the election campaign the Electoral Commission did not receive any letters or oral appeals from citizens. There were no criticisms of the candidates.

We received only one letter from Miass party gorkom in Chelyabinsk Oblast, saying that Comrade Shustov held a number of meetings with the city's labor collectives, and an enlarged gorkom plenum held on 22 January supported his candidacy as a USSR people's deputy from the CPSU.

The Electoral Commission proposes that the following procedure be established for the election: First, to give each candidate USSR people's deputy the opportunity to address the plenum, then to discuss the candidacies and move on to the vote.

P.A. Abrosov (Fitter at the Moscow Automated Production Lines Plant Named for the 50th Anniversary of the USSR, Candidate USSR People's Deputy From the CPSU)

Esteemed comrades! Allow me to introduce myself briefly. I am 45, I was born in Moscow. After eight years at school, I went to technical school. After graduating from technical school, I came to work at the automated production lines plant, with which I have associated my entire future, my life. I served in the army. After leaving the army I graduated from evening school and the Moscow Machine Tool Technical College, and I am still working at the plant. My record shows 29 years of work at the enterprise. I have been in the CPSU since 1973. I have government awards for my work. I am a member of the plant party committee and member of Taganskiy party raykom [rayon committee] bureau. I am married, with a son.

My production acitvity involves the development, fitting, and tuning of automated lines of specialized machine tools at plants belonging to the Ministry of Automotive and Agricultural Machine Building. We thereby contribute to the best of our ability to automation, mechanization, and the introduction of scientific and technical progress in these sectors.

I was nominated as a candidate USSR people's deputy by the plant's communists and my candidacy was discussed and supported by the rayon's communists and approved at the CPSU Central Committee December Plenum.

During that time I have repeatedly had meetings in labor collectives, talked with communists, addressed meetings, and contributed to the central and local press. The main thing I have taken out of these meetings is the growing process of politicization and support for perestroyka. What people like about perestroyka is glasnost, democratization, and the ending of alienation from the means of production; the collectives discuss eagerly the Law on Land, the Law on Ownership, and the CPSU Central Committee Platform for the 28th congress. There has been a positive response to the proposed draft on the introduction of presidential power; people see this as an opportunity to stabilize the situation in the country and emerge from the political and economic crisis.

But there is much that is causing concern. First and foremost in the economy—the position of working people; people are worried about rising prices, inflation, empty shelves. The government is not properly implementing measures expressing the vital interests of the working class, and this is causing justified dissatisfaction. The main bulk of the working people are becoming increasingly dissatisfied with their work, because of the poor organization of labor and working conditions. There is a growing sense of uncertainty and discomfort in society, a lack of direct interest, on the part of working people at state enterprises, in productive and highly efficient labor. As a candidate deputy from the party, I was often asked at meetings in the labor collectives: Do we perhaps need some other organization to express the working people's interests more fully? I reply: Our party was born as a working class party, and I do not see that its interests are contrary to the working people's interests in the process of perestroyka. And naturally, my position as a candidate people's deputy takes on board the opinion and instructions of working people and reflects their feelings and needs.

In the event of my election as a USSR people's deputy, my objective will be to uphold the following fundamental principles. For the working person—to seek an increase in his free time, as a necessary factor for improving his general educational and cultural level, leisure, and the raising of children. The planned growth in labor productivity should take place on the basis of progressive labor methods, forecasting, and the introduction of scientific and technical progrress. To seek social protection for pensioners, improved medical services for them, and inflation-linked pensions. For young people—to put into practice modern teaching methods based on the utilization of the achievements of scientific and technical progress and world culture, and ensure real participation by them in the country's sociopolitical life and the resolution of social and domestic problems.

To achieve these aims, I consider it a priority task to enhance the prestige of the working person and emancipate him, since only free, conscientious labor is the source of all material and spiritual wealth.

That is all. Thank you for your attention.

M.S. Gorbachev: Any questions for Pavel Andreyevich? No. Thank you.

N.P. Kustarev (Smith at the Gorkiy Truck Plant, Candidate USSR People's Deputy From the CPSU)

Comrades, may I introduce myself, too. I was born in 1948 and have been a member of the CSPU since 1968; I work at the Gorkiy Truck Plant as a forge and press operator; I am married, with two children. I am in the fourth year at the law institute. Of course, I served in the army. That is my life story, in brief.

Addressing the CPSU Central Committee Plenum as a candidate USSR people's deputy from the CPSU, I must

express my positions on the party's role and place in society, since the comrades have also spoken about this.

A complex situation has arisen in society today, we all know that. The critical evaluation of the state of resolution of socioeconomic problems is growing all the time. Open attacks are made on Lenin and the ideas of the October Revolution and theoretical concepts are put forward which radically change the assessment of the historical past of our party and country and negate the peoples' achievements. That is why, comrades, for me, questions of the choice of one's civic stance are in the forefront today, such questions as whom to follow, whom to support, what forces to draw on.

I make no secret of my views and convictions, and I resolutely reject attempts to falsify the historical significance of Great October and the achievements of our people and to misrepresent the CPSU's role in transforming society and replace socialist values with capitalist values. I am in favor of socialism as a developing, democratic society.

Some comrades have already gone so far, in the "Discussion Pamphlet" feature in PRAVDA, that people are saying that attacks on Lenin are now being made openly. I too must now make it clear: Am I a Leninist, or not. I can say, comrades, yes, I am a Leninist. And I support the CPSU's principled course of perestroyka and the renewal and normalization of all aspects of society's life, the eventual aim being to increase the people's prosperity with the wide support of working people. An example here is the All-Union Conference of Representatives of the Working Class, Peasantry, and Engineering and Technical Workers, where the working people's opinions and views on urgent matters were put forward. Speaking at this conference, I came out in support of the party's being a consolidating and unifying force.

Comrades, I am in solidarity with the CPSU Platform on Nationalities Policy and I advocate the harmonization of interethnic relations, taking into account the interests of people of all nationalities. At the same time I am in favor of a harsh rebuff for all manifestations of nationalism. I regard as most important the democratization of Soviet society and the full implementation of the political slogan "All power to the soviets!"

In my program I consider it necessary to single out the vitally important, priority problems, and I will seek their resolution. I number among them: The improvement of housing conditions, the devleopment of the social sphere, the provision of food and consumer goods for the working people, the improvement of the state of the environment, the education and raising of young people, and the strengthening of law and order. The way to resolve these problems lies, for me, in personal participation in the improvement of legislation, the development of an appropriate mechanism, and its implementation in close contact with party, soviet, and economic organs.

I know you are all tired. So I will try to cut short my speech. I am opposed to the defamation of our army. And this is not because my son is serving in the army and my second son is preparing to serve, in a year's time. As a worker and a communist I feel in my heart where this defamation will lead. The army has weapons. If we slander the army, if we create difficulties for it, these weapons could turn against our socialist system. I am fiercely opposed to slandering the army.

In the sphere of the protection of law and order and the strengthening of discipline, I advocate resolutely stepping up the struggle against crime and violations of public order and ensuring citizens' personal safety and their property and other rights.

I also support the strengthening of discipline. Before I came here I was asked: How do you envisage a law that would boost our economy? As a worker, let me tell you: Whatever wonderful law we may adopt, if there is no discipline and order, no law is going to work. It is we workers who will suffer most, because if we break labor and production discipline, if we break contractual discipline concerning deliveries and technological discipline, then—as a consequence—we find ourselves working "overtime," working "extensions," working every Saturday, when we should be with our children and families.

As a former oblast soviet deputy and a candidate USSR people's deputy I support and will support all initiatives—even if I am not elected deputy—that are associated with the work of the Komsomol, with young people.

I know how hard this is to achieve. We all know that there has to be work with young people. We all see that it is necessary to create health and fitness clubs and leisure complexes, something to occupy young people. We all realize this, but in practice it sometimes turns out differently.

I will support any social organization except those social organizations that call for the violent overthrow of our system. As a candidate from the CPSU I cannot, of course, omit to mention another sphere—our ideology. Mikhail Sergeyevich said at the end of his report: "The party needs political fighters." Why are working class communists now evading debates, evading discussions? Because working class communists have lost the grain of rationality that was characteristic of the Bolsheviks. To be precise: The art of speaking from a platform. Any platform will do! A box will do, a cart will do. They used to bring our party's policy to the people, in accessible language. We do not do this now.

As an analogy, let me compare the present situation with the battle on the river Kalka (who knows—1223), when the enemy, having surrounded the Russian knights, proposed that they lay down their arms. Our Russian knights were honorable knights, they laid down their arms, trusting the enemy's promises. And all of them fell on that field. Furthermore, that battle on the Kalka resembles today's situation because today, too, we are fighting in single combat. Remember, the prince of

Chernigov fought, while the prince of Kiev, with his bodyguard, stood watching until his turn came.

We have the same thing now. I, as a communist, and my comrades cannot understand: How can this be? For a whole obkom to disband! There are comrades who were wrong. There were others who, through their behavior or, as the lawyers put it, "through their deeds," committed unlawful acts. So they should be expelled from the party, removed from their posts. But the obkom?! Fine, they remove the obkom. Then the question arises: Where are we, comrades?! Where are our primary party organizations?! Because we formerly, in practice, discussed all the country's internal questions in the primary party organizations!

Joint work by all communists to rectify mistakes and prevent them from recurring—that is my concrete proposal. Suppose that in the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] or in a union republic, such an extraordinary thing were to happen as the disbanding of a particular obkom or a vote of no confidence in it, then we should without fail study it in all the primary organizations and see whether we too have the same shortcomings. And take measures to prevent these shortcomings. And publish all the documents openly. Then the people will trust us, comrades.

In conclusion, I would like to mention political education. As a working class communist, I do not like our political education as it is now. We are lagging behind now. In what way? The standard of the working class has improved now. We, our workers, have secondary, secondary technical, and higher education. Political education must approach them in the light of this standard, skillfully, making use of our scholars.

Thank you for your attention.

M.S. Gorbachev: Any questions for Nikolay Petrovich?

A.A. Logunov: Nikolay Petrovich! You have been engaged in technology for a quarter of a century. Why did you not start studying in that area, rather than at the law school? Please explain your reasons.

N.P. Kustarev: I did not hear you, please repeat the question....

M.S. Gorbachev: Academician Logunov, rector of Moscow State University, asks: You have been involved with technology all your life, yet you are studying at the law faculty.

N.P. Kustarev: Let me tell you. When I was elected oblast soviet deputy, I felt I was disastrously lacking in knowledge, and I started studying at the law institute.

M.S. Gorbachev: That is quite clear.

A.P. Shustov (Electrical Fitter at the Moscow "Stankokonstruktsiya" Plant and candidate USSR People's Deputy from the CPSU)

Comrades, I was born in the city of Miassa in Chelyabinsk Oblast in 1946. My parents had been evacuated there. In 1947 my family returned to Moscow. Here I completed my schooling and became an electrical fitter at the "Stankokonstruktsiya" plant—first as a trainee and now on the top grade. In 1961 I joined the Komsomol and since 1969 I have been a member of the CPSU. I have been involved in diverse public work and am currently a member of the Bureau of Moscow's Oktyabrskiy CPSU Raykom and a member of the party gorkom. In my work and election program I proceed from the conviction that a communist elected to be a people's deputy builds his activity on the basis of the CPSU Platform.

The draft for the 28th party congress currently under discussion basically reflects the complex package of problems facing our society and maps out paths of renewal. In my view this document lacks specificity and sometimes resoluteness.

At the election meetings I have held there have been many questions and exchanges of views on restructuring in the CPSU and the democratization of intraparty life. I have been mandated to seek the abolition of Article 6 of the USSR Constitution, to seek complete glasnost in the work of party organs at every level, and to seek direct competitive elections of delegates to the 28th CPSU Congress.

The partywide discussion that has gotten underway about the party's place and role is yielding results. The communists of Moscow and our Oktyabrskiy Rayon are playing an active part in it.

The party's cause, the cause of the renewal of socialism, are today in great need of practical results and positive changes, particularly in the socioeconomic sphere. It is important that they be based on the implementation of economic and political reforms and provide convincing confirmation of them.

The social reorientation of the economy proclaimed as perestroyka should already have resulted in a real increase in living standards. It is clear that reforms alone cannot yield results unless they are backed up by action and labor. I am very concerned that the theme of labor and reliance on labor is little heard in our society. The congresses of people's deputies and sessions of the Supreme Soviet are no exception. This is a real misfortune.

In an atmosphere of a decline in state and labor discipline we find the shadow economy, speculation, and trickery flourishing. Real conditions exist for making an easy profit and expropriating the results of other people's labor. Among a section of Soviet people there is a shift toward consumerism and a decline in the prestige of conscientious, honest labor. Scientific institutions, state

enterprises, and cooperatives operate in different conditions. Economic independence for labor collectives has been proclaimed but not implemented in practice, and its existence only on paper results in losses and difficulties of existence for workers.

Worn-out equipment, obsolete technologies, an unattractive atmosphere, and low standards—these are the realities which people encounter at most of our enterprises. Work is accompanied by mismanagement, idle periods, and blitz periods. Production is laxly planned and poorly organized and provided with raw materials, energy, and components. Often people, including women, work in harmful and dangerous conditions. The monotony of labor is oppressive.

With things organized this way, exhortations to work will yield few results, and the negative factors at work hit first and foremost those who are able and willing to work well.

Normal working conditions and efficient labor are inconceivable without good equipment, and this is only possible on the basis of scientific and technical progress. It worries me that the slackening of attention to problems of scientific and technical progress threatens to result in renewed laggardness. I am convinced that it is precisely on the basis of scientific and technical progress combined with economic reform that it is possible to create a modern economy capable of also resolving the urgent tasks and ensuring the prospect of the development of our society.

The retooling of industry entails an increase in demand for metal cutting machine tools, but the equipment that we already have is poorly utilized. Some equipment has not even been installed. Machine tool and automatic line idle times are great. This is intolerable wastefulness. At present it is extremely important for us to handle what we possess correctly and thriftily. The opportunities for the conversion of defense sectors, for example. The defense industry's experience, development projects, and technologies must be utilized in other sectors to resolve the strategic tasks of scientific and technical progress. The efforts of our remarkable engineer and worker cadres must be directed toward the development of sophisticated and reliable equipment with diverse applications.

One of the most burning problems—ecology—is linked most directly with scientific and technical progress. This question was also raised at election meetings. Ecological profiles of enterprises are currently being compiled in our Oktyabrskiy Rayon, and the question of removing the industrial rubber products plant from the territory of the rayon is being resolved. The measures that are being implemented are being coordinated by a rayon ecological center created by the party raykom bureau and rayispolkom. I know that in foreign countries there are certification centers which categorize machine tools and machines not in terms of their capacity, productivity, or versatility but in terms of just two parameters: People safety and environmental safety. In concentrating our main efforts on the development and introduction of waste-free, energy-saving, and harmless technological processes, machinery, and means of transport, the construction of purification installations, and the implementation of environmental protection measures, we must make scientific and technical progress the guarantor of environmental recovery.

The projected fundamental measures to restructure management of the economy and the government's programs are bound to rectify the situation, in my view. But as yet the economic reform has not given much to working people. In fact working people do not need to be given things. The prime obligation of Soviet power and its organs is to create favorable conditions for realizing people's potential and satisfying their needs on that basis. The resolution of economic and social tasks will lead to the unification of the efforts of workers, peasants, scientists, engineers, and managers; practically all strata of the population can realize their potential in the conditions of the democratic and humane socialism that we are creating. It is extremely important for me as a working person to defend the interests of people who invest their labor and knowledge in the common cause. It is vexing to sometimes see deputies defending the interests of just individual groups of society. Through their decisions and actions people's deputies and the government must boost Soviet people's activeness and interest and ensure social protection for those who need it.

In setting the task of building renewed socialism we should not, in my view, abandon communist ideals. Being concepts of social justice to the supreme degree, they have become a worldwide asset. In proclaiming the priority of general human interests we are taking a step toward out ideals. Such is my position as a candidate for USSR people's deputy from the CPSU. [Shustov ends]

M.S. Gorbachev: Any questions for Aleksey Petrovich? Go ahead, please.

V.V. Karpov: Excuse me, Aleksey Petrovich. There seems to be no mention of army service in your biography. Did you not serve? And if not, why not?

A.P. Shustov: On health grounds.

M.S. Gorbachev: Fine. Thank you. No more questions? No. Thank you.

As already reported, as a result of a secret ballot at the CPSU Central Committee plenum Nikolay Petrovich Kustarev was elected USSR people's deputy from the CPSU.

Ligachev, Others Address Party Plenum

PM1903142790 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 18 Mar 90 Second Edition p 3

[Unattributed report on 16 March speeches at CPSU Central Committee Plenum: "Speeches at CPSU Central Committee Plenum"]

[Text] **K. Salykov (member of the CPSU Central Committee and chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Committee for Questions of Ecology and the Rational Use of Natural Resources)**

The question under examination is of fundamental importance for the party. It is therefore hard to remain impartial. In Shakespeare's "Hamlet" there is a scene where Hamlet is asked where Polonius is and he replies: "At supper. Not where he eats but where he is eaten." That is what is happening in our country with the party. It is not the party which is making the communists answerable for the fulfillment of statutory requirements, the party and its central organs are being beaten on all sides. Attacks of all kinds are being leveled: In some places for a reason, but in some places without knowing why. Some comrades have begun to act according to the principle: "Beat your own men so that others are afraid," but the others are not afraid, they are laughing.

I think that Comrade Frolov discerned the "Mishin camouflage" theory in a politically correct way at the start of the plenum. In my opinion now is not the time for personal ambitions. We must think about how to preserve the party and its prestige, strengthen our Union, and introduce order in the country. It is becoming perturbing that no due rebuff is being given to political careerism and irresponsible playing to the public. That is a fact of life but, without allowing a shadow of dismay, we must draw sensible conclusions. We cannot succumb to the ruses of political mongering and adventurism and, in the ardor of petty disputes, lose the main principles of the ideas of Marxism-Leninism and the causes and concerns of perestroyka.

In this connection the draft statutes submitted for discussion should accord with the demands of the time and correspond to the party's program platform.

The people are looking at us closely to see what our party will be like. We must justify people's hope and ensure the CPSU's truly vanguard role.

Today we need a radically renewed Communist Party. I personally see the CPSU as a single sociopolitical organization of the USSR with strong, truly independent party organizations in all union and autonomous republics, including the party organizations and future Central Committee of the Russian Federation's party organization.

Under present conditions, by uniting all healthy forces of society, the party must defend more actively the interests of democracy, the interests of the people, the interests of the rule-of-law state. Those are truths known to all. I would draw special attention to the fact that we must wage an intensified struggle to resolve urgent, acute problems of the economy and interethnic questions and in particular questions of ecological safety. That last question is becoming critical, yet so far the CPSU Central Committee is paying only feeble attention to it. As I understand it a renewed Communist Party is an enterprising and businesslike party of the kind which will leave the offices to mount the rostrum of revolutionary perestroyka, win the vanguard role, and exert effective influence on the stabilization of the situation in the country. This aspect of the matter should be clearly reflected in the draft of the new party statutes.

The perestroyka taking place in the country has given rise to profound changes in sociopolitical life. Not only positive but also negative experience has been accumulated. In some regions party committees have not simply let slip but have essentially voluntarily surrendered the initiative to more active and persistent public movements. The people expect resolute actions and have come out onto the street. I am not in favor of meetings democracy, but the ability to work with the masses under any conditions is now our main task.

The party must primarily detect in good time the dominant manifestations of interests, know the trends and processes taking place in society, and act more vigorously and responsibility and, most important, with more initiative. We must resolutely denounce instances where instead of taking vigorous steps people have begun to grumble about others, right up to the USSR Supreme Soviet.

It is desirable that the stepping up of demands on efficiency and initiative be traced in the party statutes. We are losing the initiative—we are losing everything, and that is why the principle of preemptive initiative should operate in the defense of the interests of working people and individual groups, regions, and nationalities, and primarily where many very acute problems have accumulated like the tragedy of Chernobyl or the Aral catastrophe, like the problems of the minority people, of autonomous republics, and of the ecology of the industrial centers.

Second, the matter is being ruined by the unaware inertia in some leading comrades' attitude toward everything unusual, including public organizations which essentially cannot be a political opposition. Obviously the statutes should record that a CPSU member has the right to take part in the work of any public organizations and movements whose activity does not contradict the CPSU program platform and statutes, the party's aims and tasks, or the demands of the USSR Constitution and the constitutions of the union and autonomous republics. It is important that he should boldly defend the CPSU's interests there. Marxism-Leninism has been and remains the point of departure for communists. Evidently the statutes should emphasize that we base ourselves on the development of the humanist, internationalist ideas of Marx, Engels, and Lenin.

I consider the attitude toward our intelligentsia and peasantry to be another important element. The CPSU is based on the socialist choice not only of the working class but also of all citizens which recognize its ideological-political program platform. I believe that in this matter it

is correct to adhere to previous formulations of the statutes and to clearly name in it workers, peasantry, and intelligentsia.

I have also given serious thought to the definition of an alliance of like- minded communists. It seems to me that it brings to mind someone who opposes dissent. The draft CPSU Statutes allow the comparison of different views and welcome what is essentially freedom of opinion and assessment for communists. Will it not be better to introduce the concept of a voluntary association of communists?

In my view we cannot let slip either elements such as the ensuring of man's comprehensive development and the exclusion of any forms of man's exploitation. We should perhaps introduce these fundamental provisions in a short form in the draft. Proceeding from the considerations voiced above it would be possible to substantially alter the first part of the preamble. I want to submit my proposal on this matter in written form.

The draft's preamble should be brief and succinct, that is true. But on the other hand it essentially represents general provisions. That is why we should probably introduce juridical and legal aspects and head the preamble "General Provisions."

Surely it would not be superfluous for us to write that the CPSU is a legal body which builds its activity on the basis of the principles of self organization and public self management and self financing in according with the USSR Constitution and the legislative acts of the USSR and RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] and these statutes and that it enjoys all rights provided to public organizations by legislation.

Considering the present division of the party's property in Lithuania, a note is required to the effect that the CPSU has an independent balance and current and other accounts in USSR banks, a seal with a coat of arms and a round seal and stamps with its names, its own emblem, and other appurtenances. I proceed from the premise that the CPSU should not later be reproached for allowing attributes not envisaged by its own statutes. Obviously we must now proceed from the conditions of the party's life in the rule-of-law state. The party must be more punctilious in matters of this kind.

And the last thing toward which I should like to draw special attention is the raising of personal responsibility in the party for decisions taken collegially. In my opinion the draft of the new statutes should state that collegiality in the work of party organs in elaborating decisions is combined with communists' personal responsibility for the decisions taken and for their fulfillment. Society legitimately demands that the party put an end to the pernicious practice whereby decisions are taken by some people but responsibility for the result obtained is borne by others or by no one at all. I think an entry of this kind in the statutes will help matters.

K.Z. Romazanov (member of the CPSU Central Auditing Commission, steel worker at the Karaganda metallurgical combine)

Comrades! First I should like to say that unfortunately the hasty preparation of very important party documents is becoming a tradition. This applies in particular to the draft Central Committee platform and the draft party statutes. For instance, I received the final draft only on 7 March, and could I in that brief time consult with the party organizations even at my own enterprise or in my own city? Of course not. Yet it was essential to do this and with as broad a range as possible of party members before discussing the draft statutes at today's plenum.

Second, as a participant in the February Plenum I was literally inundated with questions: Why has the resolution on holding reports and elections in the party organizations not been published? Why will they be held before the congress, contrary to the opinion of the majority of those who spoke at the plenum? And in general how can a full-blooded report and election campaign be conducted in such a brief period?

Our republican party organization's central committee has already taken a decision on this score and the grass roots, bowing to party discipline, have in practice already begun it. But there is nonetheless no complete confidence in the correctness of this approach in the primary organizations. That is why I think that even today it is not too late to postpone the report and election campaign to a later period. It seems to me that this will be greeted with understanding and will make it possible to rally in the primary organizations, which are the foundation of the party, those communists who can accept the fundamental revolutionary decisions of the congress sincerely and with conviction.

A committed discussion of the draft platform and the procedure for electing delegates to the 28th CPSU Congress is now under way in the party organizations. Many constructive proposals are emerging which are being sent to the CPSU Central Committee. The main thing is that they should be noted and considered in completing work on the platform. As for the procedure for electing delegates to the congress, the communists of the Karaganda Oblast party organization express the unanimous opinion that there should be secret, direct, equal, and alternative elections by the party okrug [national district].

As a member of the Central Auditing Commission, I am perturbed by questions of the party budget, its formation, and expenditure. To my shame, to this day I do not know how much of party dues is being spent on what. It is true that I recently acquainted myself with Comrade Kruchina's interview. But I should like to know this not from articles but from more detailed reports. Communists today are interested in how 100 percent of the party budget is spent. And only after we have found out where all party money goes should communists decide whether this money is being correctly or incorrectly spent and the directions in which these funds should be used in future.

There is no doubt that the party budget should be formed from the bottom up and not vice versa.

Here I want to mention the independence of party organizations, which are assigned a sufficient space in the seventh section of the draft platform. But for some reason independence in deciding structural and financial questions and determining expenditure for financing the activity of primary organizations is restricted to republican and oblast party organizations while the gorkoms [city committees] and raykoms [rayon party committee], which work in direct contact with the primary organizations, are left out. My opinion is that it is not a higher ranking party committee which should determine the staff and structure of a lower ranking one, but only en elected organ, that is plenums and conferences, which should do so. We will thus make the apparatus subordinate to the elected organs.

I suggest including among immediate and urgent measures the immediate legislative allocation of functions and determining of the party's place in the system of the management of society and the country. I am also sure that it is essential before the congress to reduce the number of echelons and numerical strength of the party apparatus. After all, if the party is indeed going to hand over power to the soviets, why does it need socioeconomic, agrarian, state and legal, and other essentially sectorial, economic departments? It is important to abandon more resolutely the demands made on local party organs for the state of purely economic matters in organizations.

The draft platform does not answer the main question: How to set up direct communication and feedback between the Central Committee and the primary organization and the other way? It is essential to achieve equal responsibility of the grassroots party organizations before the higher ranking ones and in that direction there are some positive elements as there are in the opposite direction—from Central Committee to primary organizations. Here responsibility is blatantly not at the proper level.

Now my attitude toward some provisions of the draft CPSU statutes. For instance, in subsection 5 on page 3, I suggest excluding the paragraph which mentions the procedure for expelling from the party a CPSU member who belongs to an elected party organ because it contradicts subsection 2, which states that all are equal in the party.

In the same subsection on page 3 the final paragraph "measures of party education and influence in the form of comradely criticism" should be left while the remaining measures should be removed—"warnings, reprimands, and sanction."

On page 7, subsection 15, we should remove the provision: "They bear responsibility for recommended cadres to the labor collectives and state and public organizations" and the rest should be according to the text.

On page 9 in subsection 18 after the words "They are created when there are at least three CPSU members at their place of work or residence" we should add "at the communists' decision" and then according to the text. In the same place in the second paragraph we should make the alteration "primary party organizations are given the right" and then according to the text.

On page 11 subsection 21 second paragraph from the top we should add after the words "forms executive organs, forms the commission, creates its own apparatus" the words "determines independently the frequency and procedure for holding plenums." In the same paragraph after the words "perform political work among the working people of the rayon or city" we should remove "resolves questions of CPSU membership" and then according to the text.

In section 6 on the party's property and monetary funds on page 20, I suggest the following draft: "The maximum percentage for levying dues should be set at two percent," that is 1.5 percent should be levied from 200 to 250 rubles [R] and two percent from more than R250. And we should restrict ourselves to this.

Subsection 38, final paragraph should be formulated as follows: "Working communist pensioners pay membership dues only from their wages and membership dues are not paid from the invalid pensions communists receive."

Subsection 39 should begin with the words: "The union republic communist parties and kray, oblast, city, and rayon party organizations dispose of their budgets independently, seeking an increase in revenue whic.. ensures the transition to self financing, and decide the structure—staff and financial questions." The next proposal according to the text. Thank you.

A.S. Myakota (first secretary of the Ukrainian Communist Party Poltava Obkom [Oblast Committee])

Esteemed comrades, today the main thing which perturbs us all is the fate of the country, the fate of our party. The draft Central Committee platform for the congress which has been published in the press has given rise to nationwide discussion. The communists of our oblast are in favor of accelerating perestroyka processes and renewing the party and link this directly with the draft CPSU statutes. Over 1,000 proposals on this matter have already come in from primary party organizations. The absolute majority of communists believes that, if we are in favor of a united CPSU, we must also have united statutes. Or, at least, we must have united foundations, united approaches toward the elaboration of the statutes of the union republic communist parties. I regard as being of fundamental importance the thesis of the consolidation of the party's basic echelon—the primary party organization. I cannot agree with those who suggest switching to the territorial principle for forming primary organizations. Still less that they be created on the basis of interests, where people can move freely from one organization to another. This position contradicts our

party's vanguard role. The formation of party organizations on the territorial principle or according to interests will inevitable entail their departure from participation in the solution of economic tasks, and that cannot be allowed.

The party obkom [oblast party committee] supports the proposal of many party organizations regarding the statutes' enshrinement of the right to resolve definitively the question of admission to the party and to examine personal matters directly in the primary party organizations. This matter must be conducted openly [glasnost] in view of the entire labor collective.

I submit the proposal that the party statutes define the status of the primary party organization secretary. The communists' demand that a full time worker perform party work in primary party organizations where there are over 50 CPSU members is being heard increasingly persistently today. This is particularly topical now in connection with the labor collectives' transition to the lease contract and economic accountability [khozraschet]. The question arises: But where are we to get the money to pay the secretary? We believe that considerably more rights should be given to the party obkoms and gorkoms and raykoms so that they can determine for themselves the structure of the apparatus, the numbers of full time workers, and the size of their salaries.

The statutes should provide for the primary party organizations' right to keep 50 percent of the funds from membership dues.

Questions regarding the raykom-gorkom structure in cities of 300,000-350,000 inhabitants have become urgent. Many of the oblast's communists are in favor of creating a strong party gorkom, abolishing raykoms, with the funds released going to the needs of primary party organizations.

We should resolutely put an end to the practice whereby questions are examined by the CPSU Central Committee Plenum and then discussed in all party echelons without exception. It has gotten to the point where the majority of agendas for meetings have been recommended from above. The efforts of the primary party organizations and party gorkoms and raykoms should in our opinion be focused primarily on the implementation of specific practical deeds. They must decide for themselves what questions they are to examine and where and when. I support the proposal that the CPSU statutes should not regulate the frequency of party meetings and party committee plenums.

Some of the questions which we are now submitting to the plenum could have been examined at commission sittings. And plenums could be convened as necessary, at least two to three times a year.

In examining the draft of the new statutes I should like also to mention discipline and communists' responsibility for the implementation of our party's policy irrespective of the posts they hold. I believe that Lenin's demands must be preserved without fail in the new CPSU statutes.

I shall cite one example. In 1986 the CPSU Central Committee and the country's Council of Ministers adopted a resolution on providing incentives to collective farms in the form of equipment and materials for the above-plan sale of grain. A necessary resolution. We support it. Over these years the oblast has sold 1 million tonnes of grain over and above the plan. But at the same time it has failed to receive 410 trucks of various brands and 420 kilometers of pipes. A great deal of other agricultural equipment has not been received.

Or take the following example. Over two years the collective farms have been allocated 60,000 tonnes of mixed feed for above-plan output, but the farms have not received this feed. Yet it represents 10,000 tonnes of meat. Under these conditions the leaders are obliged to resort to ruse, to seek ways of selling their output as advantageously as possible. And here it is purely local interests which often come first. PRAVDA wrote about this in the article "Bird Burns the Hand" 5 January this year.

I think the Central Committee and its Politburo should, according to the party statutes, make answerable those communists who took this decision and failed to ensure its fulfillment.

During the discussion of the draft CPSU Central Committee platform proposals are coming in for the clearer definition of economic relations between republics. I want to cite one such example. Cotton is shipped for processing to Poltava, thousands of kilometers from Uzbekistan, while we have a shortage of manpower and are assisted by Vietnamese workers. At the same time, as Comrade I.A. Karimov said at the CPSU Central Committee February Plenum, there are thousands of unemployed in their republic.

And another fundamental question—the state order. Esteemed Nikolay Ivanovich, what independence can there be for enterprises if this year a 100 percent order has been brought in not only for technical output but also for consumer goods. The situation is the same in agriculture. The state order for meat is 75 percent and in the current five-year plan alone it has increased by 15,000 tonnes while our oblast receives from the market stocks only 34 kg of meat products per urban inhabitant. We realize that at the present stage the state order is an enforced measure. But, esteemed comrades, it should be realistic and planned to ensure that everyone—from farm to oblast and republic and the entire country—is interested in its fulfillment and that there is a tangible improvement in services for the population.

About the editors of party publications. In our opinion, the statutes should enshrine the principle that the congress or conference determines whether a press organ should be the organ of the entire party organization or of its committee. And only after that should the question of the editor—whether he should be elected or appointed—be decided.

I also want to make the following proposal. The new CPSU statutes should clearly state that all party committees—from central committee to gorkoms and raykoms inclusive—should have their own press organ. It is intolerable when the oblast center—Poltava City—or Komsomolsk City with a population of 60,000 do not have ttheir own press organs. And this does not apply only to our oblast. I think that there is no need to prove here why Vladimir Ilich began to create the party by organizing a newspaper. In examining the draft platform and CPSU statutes for the congress, the oblast communists are aware of the complexity and crucial nature of the tasks of the current moment and have asked me to convey to the plenum that they are particularly worried by the situation which is now being fuelled in the country to a dramatic point. This was mentioned with great alarm at the recent Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee Plenum. The measures taken by the party Central Committee and the country's Supreme Soviet and government may be said to be belated and in many regards merely for show.

We see just one way out: Everyone—from primary party organization to the Central Committee and its Politburo—must immediately come to the defense of our party and introduce order in the country. We cannot delay any more, comrades. If we underestimate the situation something irreparable may happen: We will ruin perestroyka, aggravate the already complex interethnic relations, and destroy the economy. Were this to happen, the people would not forgive us. Thank you for your attention.

V.A. Churilov (first secretary of Khanty-Mansiyskiy Okrug party committee, Tyumen Oblast)

Noting the undoubtedly progressive and radical nature of the draft statutes, I would like to note at the same time that the authors have not been fully successful in casting off political monopolism and presenting the party as a component—the main and a strong one, of course, but a component nonetheless—of the political system. The draft does not reflect the new conditions for the CPSU's activity both outside and inside the party.

And now a few suggestions on the draft.

First, having set the goal of consolidating Soviet society around its platform, the party itself will be unable to manage without a mechanism for rallying the diverse groups, approaches, and platforms. It would be correct if this were stated in subsection 13 of the statutes, and if a provision were made for the possibility of making decisions on the basis of consensus.

The same topic must be raised in points 35 and 36. They have been written from positions of absolute supremacy in soviets and public organizations. Matters are much more different in practice, however. Our okrug has already had experience of city soviets where communists account for less than one-half of deputies. I am convinced that the current elections will also produce similar examples.

Second, having proclaimed the transfer of power to the party masses, the draft statutes do not offer a mechanism for the exercise of this power. The enabling provision that "debates and referendums can be held" in subsection 6 must be replaced by the mandatory "shall be regularly held." In addition, the results of debates must be linked with decisionmaking. Otherwise, why make all the fuss?

In my capacity as a communist I, for one, feel embittered not by the fact that this draft was prepared without my participation, but by the fact that I shall not be called upon to participate in the future, either. This means that anonymous resolutions and anonymous drafts will continue to emerge within the party, like they did in the past. This cannot be allowed to happen. What we need is a set of procedural rules governing party life, a "technology of democracy" if you like, which would really place party members and primary party organizations in the vortex of events, not only as regards questions of delegate elections but also as regards decisionmaking, in other words as regards shouldering responsibility. It might be possible, for example, to have Article Two laying down the right of CPSU members not only to freely discuss questions but also to participate in preparatory decisionmaking.

We are correct in protecting the minority's rights, but it is equally topical to implement the majority's rights, to create a mechanism for taking into account the opinions of communists in their millions.

Third, I am convinced that not all Central Committee members know the nature of the party's structural component known as okruzhkom [okrug party committee]. Consequently, the draft statutes speak of them in the same breath as raykoms [rayon party committees] on one occasion (point 10), and as obkoms [oblast party committees) on another (point 22). I think that it would be correct to speak of okrug party organizations with city and rayon subdivisions in the one case, and of okrug party organizations without such subdivisions in the other. They can simply be known as okrug organizations. After all, our okrug party organization, for example, has 13 party gorkoms [city committees] and raykoms and more than 61,000 communists.

Comrades, many communists in the okrug believe that a special commission, comprising members and candidate members of the Central Committee, secretaries of party organizations and party committees, and representatives of various streams within the CPSU, is needed when it comes to preparations for the congress. This commission

could operate on "round table" principles, on principles of dialogue, giving utmost consideration to the entire diversity of viewpoints right at the preparations stage. I am talking not so much about forms but about content, about the method which should become the party's renewed ideology. This is a real step as regards the democratization of relations in the party.

In conclusion, a few words about the situation in Tyumen Oblast's Khanty-Mansiyskiy Autonomous Okrug. It will take more than a month before most of the okrug's city and rayon local soviets are able to convene their sessions and elect executive committees. About 40 percent of soviet and party organ leaders failed to get elected as deputies. The resulting vacuum of power is being aggravated by the growing social tension in labor collectives, the growth of feelings that are difficult to control, and the onset of labor disputes with the government.

We would earnestly ask party members, officials from the Council of Ministers, ministries, and departments, and CPSU Central Committee officials to stop sending us replies like the letter from CPSU Member Durasov who works at the USSR Gosplan [State Planning Committee]. Comrade Yu.A. Gankovskiy, secretary of "Nizhnevartovskneftegaz" Association's party committee, spoke about the address by participants in a Tyumen party obkom plenum at the Central Committee February plenum. As a result, it was explained to us by the highest authorities that we cannot trade in oil and that it would result—and I quote—in a "deterioration of the country's balance of payments in 1990." But the Ministry of Petroleum and Gas Industry and the "Gazprom" Concern could use part of their foreign currency funds in the near future and—and I quote again—"channel them into the purchase of imported meat and other foodstuffs for working people in Tyumen Oblast's oil and gas complex."

I am not panicking, I am not inclined toward undue haste, but the situation in the oblast is alarming, tense, critical.

I would ask party members in leadership positions to bear this in mind when dealing with the oblast's labor collectives and to help. To help us, their party comrades, but not in the way CPSU Member Comrade Durasov did. Thank you.

Ye.K. Ligachev (member of the Politburo and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee)

Esteemed comrades! Social life in our country is becoming really eventful. The institution of the post of president and the election of Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev as our country's first president constituted an important stage of perestroyka.

The party is on the threshold of our congress, and this will be another landmark.

The Congress of USSR People's Deputies ended its work yesterday. We listened to an important speech by the president. It is impossible not to notice that society has approached the borderline beyond which political and economic chaos is possible.

In the context of discussing the draft CPSU Statutes, I would like to express my views on the party and the economy.

The years go by but, as we have repeatedly said, the paramount tasks affecting the interests of the whole people are still not properly solved.

Take the food problem for example. Yes, we did lay down the basic guidelines for a modern agrarian policy. I am convinced that this policy is correct, and it is yielding its results: Food production is rising. But the growth is very inadequate.

The agrarian policy must be substantially backed up in the economic sense, with additional resources, new prices, and subsidies. At present, however, much has been actually frozen. I have repeatedly raised this question at Politburo sittings, at Central Committee plenums, and at the Congress of USSR People's Deputies. The countryside is so backward both technologically and socially, and the base for the storage and processing of agricultural produce is so neglected, that it is impossible to even talk about any food sufficiency in even five or 10 years' time without a substantial increase of finances and deliveries of material resources to the agrarian sector.

No, people say, we will give the peasant his freedom, we will make him master of the land—and everything will take off. I am also in favor of the peasant being master of the land but, to put it in simple terms, forks and shovels alone are totally inadequate to, as we say, feed the country.

Time is passing, and the food knot is getting even tighter. That is a fact.

Our society has brought forth forces and people who, seeking cover under perestroyka slogans and manipulating them, are hatching schemes to disrupt society and the party, to emasculate Lenin's principles regarding party building and party activity (which applies to the CPSU Statutes). Putting it in even simpler terms, to transform it into a social democratic party, to introduce private ownership in the country, and to restore capitalist production. They actually cite the example of East Europe.

I would like to express the following opinion in this context. Yes, a far-reaching alteration of the economic system and its capitalization is now under way in some East European countries behind the radical political changes. It would be strange, to say the least, not to perceive this.

I would like to state my view on this question. We are facing a major retreat from socialism. This must be bluntly stated. But I am an optimist and I think that, in

terms of history, this is a temporary defeat. It is said that an opportunity to create a single civilization is emerging as a result of the changes occurring in East Europe. That is possible. But something completely different is happening. I am, of course, in favor of active development of peaceful cooperation between different states, but this should not happen at the cost of curtailing socialism and consolidating the international positions of capitalism. Meanwhile, everything is moving in this direction. The NATO bloc is getting stronger while the socialist community is falling apart.

The capitalist West, as Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev recently remarked, is striving to integrate a united Germany within NATO. Once this happens, it will hardly be possible to claim that international relations in our time have lost their class nature.

Returning to the country's domestic affairs, I would like to note that our misfortunes and failures are conditioned by many factors. But I would like to single out the following among them: the weakening of the party itself, both organizationally and ideologically. You may agree or disagree, but I am convinced that this is the prime reason why our country has found itself in a critical state. At the same time, I can see no other force, apart from the Soviets of People's Deputies and the Communist Party, capable of leading the country out of the acute situation and onto the path of progress. Over the last few years we have seen the emergence of something that was totally nonexistent before. Many party links are withdrawing from the economy without having properly trained the soviets. Factions and groups have started operating within the party—and this has never happened here before. Only too often, it is words rather than deeds that are used as criteria to appraise people. Just like before, some mass media are engaged in destructive work within society. The question is: Do we raise this matter in our speeches? Yes, we do. Quite frequently, however, we do so only for the sake of going on record or formulating the question, because very often it is not followed up by action. The country is literally drowning in sittings and rallies, and meanwhile the organizational work of party, state, and public organizations—I want to stress this—in implementing the government program for economic recovery, in fulfilling plans and decisions, and in following up and monitoring their execution at both central and local level has—you must agree with me, comrades—been weakened to the utmost. Maybe even more so at central level.

Much has been left to just drift along. It has actually been noticed that party officials are simply afraid of being charged with interference in economic affairs. But what if matters are going badly? Nobody is taking anyone else properly to task. Look at the anxiety and sharp criticism expressed in this context at the Congress of USSR People's Deputies when the president was being elected. In this context, I would like to ask: Can a ruling party calmly observe all this? After all, it bears political responsibility for all of the country's affairs, including and primarily the economy. The state of the economy determines a lot.

Pay attention, comrades, to the fact that last year, as well as at the start of this year, the plans for the country's socioeconomic development were wrecked. And yet this concerns the fate of many social and cultural programs. Let us be blunt about it—this has failed to properly generate any businesslike anxiety either at central or at local level. I am, comrades, altogether against the party reverting to edict methods or interfering in day-to-day economic management affairs. No, and no again. Let nobody misunderstand or misinterpret me. Of course, the general path is the path of creating a plan-market economy along the paths of economic reform.

In the last few days the extraordinary Congress of USSR People's Deputies has adopted an important decision on presidential rule. This is certainly a necessary measure in the conditions of developing democracy accompanied by decentralization of management. We are probably aware, however, that presidential power as such will not lead the country out of the complex situation. This can be done by the party and the soviets. This is why there is such a great need for the party's renewal, the new CPSU Statutes, and an active cadre policy. Otherwise—I am profoundly convinced of this—the country will not extricate itself from the state of economic disruption and political tension in the near future, and yet the people, we all, have already paid a considerable price for mistakes in the implementation of perestroyka.

I would like to voice the following thought, comrades. In my opinion, the party's renewal in line with the new statutes presupposes not only a democratization of intraparty relations, which is highly important, but also a strengthening of the organizational and ideological unity of party ranks. I would like to stress this—a parting of the ways, a cleansing of the party from all those who are destroying it, who are engaged in factional oppositionist struggle, who participate in antisocialist movements. Why make a secret of it, let us speak the truth: There are such party members in the Supreme Soviet, there are such party members in the Central Committee, they are also to be found at local level. Quite a few political phrasemongers have emerged, delivering ringing but meaningless words.

In this context, I support the proposal by communists to implement a political certification of party members. Of course, all this should be done in a responsible manner. The results of an unprincipled line of behavior can be seen from what has happened to leaders of the Lithuanian Communist Party. The actual logic of struggle, when appeasement comes to the fore, ultimately leads to political bankruptcy.

And one more matter. The process of shaping the new organs of power revealed that the working class and peasantry are very narrowly represented on them. Something similar may also occur within the party, when

conference or congress delegates are elected or when party committees are constituted. As you may realize, this is a very dangerous phenomenon from the political point of view, the acuteness of this question is growing, we are aware of it, and yet we are not taking any steps. I see no alternative to laying down provisions about the representation of workers and peasants. Otherwise the working class and the peasantry will get down to—and this is already happening in many places—creating other political organizations. There is no doubt that the party's influence among them will be undermined in such a case. In my view, this is an important question.

How do I perceive our party in a socialist society undergoing renewal in the conditions of a multiparty system? I am convinced that the Communist Party will be a mass party. It will be the party of the working class and all working people, it will be profoundly democratized and closely associated with the working masses, the nonparty people, and the social movements. I have no doubt, comrades, that it will contain society's main intellectual forces.

At the same time—and I am convinced of this, too—the Communist Party must be free of factions and oppositions because it is, as we often repeat, a party of like-minded persons, of people who are really united by the communist idea.

I perceive our party, whose life is based on the personality of communists and the primary organization, as militant to the utmost, with its strength rooted in its organization and conscientious discipline. By means of its openness, democratic nature, and its tasks and deeds, the CPSU will attract the mass of people, including young people.

A couple of words in conclusion. Sufficient time has passed to prove that the campaign against the party and Soviet power is quite well organized and coordinated. You must agree that carelessness is the most fatal element in these conditions. The time has come to resolutely rebuff the antisocialist forces. An example of this can be seen in the address by the Supreme Soviet, the CPSU Central Committee, and the government to the country's working people, which was adopted last February, and—I think—in the work done by the party in the last few days.

The Congress of People's Deputies resolution on Lithuania can be included in this. At present—or at least this is how I perceive matters—a communist's withdrawal from leadership work to the accompaniment of whoops by demagogues or the mob is tantamount to resignation from the party, they simply want to crush us morally and psychologically. I think that there must be neither confusion nor panic in our ranks. All this must be served and promoted to the utmost by our new party statutes.

USSR Law on Ownership Published 10 Mar

PM1103173190 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 10 Mar 90 Second Edition p 4

["USSR Law on Ownership in the USSR"—PRAVDA headline]

[Text]

Section I. General Provisions

Article 1. The Right of Ownership

1. The right of ownership in the USSR is recognized and protected by the law.

2. An owner, at his discretion, possesses, utilizes, and disposes of property belonging to him.

An owner is entitled to perform any actions with regard to this property which do not contravene the law. He can utilize the property to carry out any economic or other activity not prohibited by law.

3. An owner may be obliged to allow limited use of his property by other persons in the cases, on the terms, and within the limits laid down by the law.

4. On the terms and within the limits laid down by acts of legislation of the USSR and union and autonomous republics, an owner is entitled to conclude contracts with citizens regarding the use of their labor in exercising his right of ownership.

Irrespective of the form of ownership on the basis of which a citizen's labor is utilized, he is provided with the remuneration and working conditions, and also the other socioeconomic guarantees, laid down by existing legislation.

5. Exercise of the right of ownership must not damage the environment or violate the rights and legally protected interests of citizens, enterprises, institutions, organizations, and the state.

6. The utilization of any form of ownership must preclude the alienation of the working person from the means of production and exploitation of man by man.

Article 2. USSR and Union and Autonomous Republic Legislation on Ownership

1. In accordance with the USSR Constitution, the present law lays down the fundamental provisions on ownership operating throughout the territory of the USSR.

2. Ownership relations not covered by the present law are regulated by acts of legislation of the USSR and union and autonomous republics issued in accordance with it.

3. The particular features of the exercise of the right of ownership over historical and cultural monuments are defined by special legislation of the USSR and union and autonomous republics.

4. Relations with regard to the creation and utilization of inventions, discoveries, works of science, literature, and art, and other objects of intellectual ownership are regulated by special legislation of the USSR and union and autonomous republics.

Article 3. Objects of the Right of Ownership

1. Ownership may be exercised over land, subterranean resources, water, flora and fauna, buildings, installations, equipment, material and spiritual cultural items, money, securities, and other property.

2. The results of the economic utilization of property (output and revenue) belong to the owner of that property unless otherwise provided by law or contract.

Article 4. Subjects of the Right of Ownership. Forms of Ownership

1. Ownership in the USSR exists in the form of ownership by Soviet citizens, collective ownership, and state ownership.

Ownership by foreign states, international organizations, and foreign legal entities and citizens can exist in the USSR.

2. The amalgamation of property within the ownership of citizens, legal entities, and the state and the formation on this basis of mixed forms of ownership, including ownership by joint ventures involving Soviet legal entities and foreign legal entities and citizens, are permitted.

3. Acts of legislation of the union and autonomous republics can provide for other forms of ownership not covered by the present law.

4. On the basis of common (shared or joint) ownership, property can belong simultaneously to several persons, irrespective of the form of ownership.

5. The state creates the necessary conditions for the development of various forms of ownership and ensures their defense.

Article 5. Liens on Owners' Property

1. On the basis of the obligations of a legal entity, a lien can be imposed on any property belonging to that entity by right of ownership or in its full economic control or operational control, except for the instance laid down by Article 26 of the present law.

An owner is not liable for the obligations of legal entities he has created, and they are not liable for the obligations of the owner, except for the instances laid down by acts of legislation of the USSR and union and autonomous republics.

2. Citizens bear liability for their obligations in the form of the property belonging to them by right of ownership.

The list of citizens' property on which a lien cannot be imposed on the basis of creditors' claims is laid down by acts of legislation of the union and autonomous republics.

Section II. Ownership by USSR Citizens

Article 6. General Provisions Regarding Ownership by Citizens

1. Citizens' property is created and augmented via their labor income from participation in social production, from the conduct of their own economic activity and income from resources invested in credit institutions, shares, and other securities, and from the acquisition of property by inheritance or on any other basis permitted by law.

2. The citizen has the exclusive right to use his abilities for productive and creative labor.

The citizen exercises this right independently or on the basis of a labor contract.

3. With the consent of the owner, the citizen is entitled to invest money or make some other investment in the property of the enterprise, other economic organization, peasant farm, or other labor partnership in which he works on the basis of a labor contract and to participate in the distribution of the profits (revenue) of that enterprise (organization) or partnership according to the size of such investment.

4. Citizens are granted land for lifetime heritable possession in order to conduct peasant farming or a personal subsidiary plot, horticulture, and the construction and servicing of housing and to satisfy other needs laid down by law.

5. Citizens' right to inherit property is recognized and protected by the law.

Article 7. Objects of Citizens' Right of Ownership

1. Citizens may own houses, dachas, summerhouses, plants on a plot of land, means of transport, money, shares and other securities, household objects and items for personal use, means of production for conducting a peasant farm or other labor partnership, personal subsidiary plot, horticulture, truck gardening, and individual and other economic activity, output produced and income received, and also other property for purposes of consumption and production.

2. A member of a housing, housebuilding, dacha, garage, or other cooperative who has fully paid his share for the apartment, dacha, garage, or other structure or premises of which he has been given the use acquires the right of ownership of this property.

The tenant of living accommodation in a house constituting part of the state and public-sector housing stock

and the members of his family are entitled to purchase the apartment or house in question from the owner.

Once a citizen has acquired ownership of the aforementioned property, he is entitled to dispose of it at his own discretion—to sell it, bequeath it, lease it out, or perform other transactions with it that do not contravene the law.

3. Acts of legislation of the USSR and union and autonomous republics can lay down types of property that cannot be owned by citizens. The composition and value of other property acquired by the citizen with his labor income and savings or on any other basis permitted by law are not restricted.

Article 8. Ownership by Labor Partnership

1. Members of a family and other persons jointly conducting a labor partnership can own a workshop, other small enterprise in the sphere of everyday services, trade, and public catering or in other spheres of economic activity, houses and economic premises, machines, equipment, means of transport, raw materials, other materials, and other property necessary for independent economic activity.

2. The property of a labor partnership, including the output produced and the income received, is the common shared property of the members of the family and other persons jointly conducting the partnership unless a contract among them stipulates otherwise.

Article 9. Ownership by Peasant Farm and Personal Subsidiary Plot

1. A peasant farm can own houses, economic premises, plants on a parcel of land, productive and working livestock, poultry, agricultural equipment and implements, means of transport, and other property necessary for independent agricultural production and the processing and sale of output.

The output produced and income received are the property of the peasant farm and are used by it at its own discretion.

2. The property of a peasant farm belongs to its members on the basis of the right of common joint ownership, unless stipulated otherwise by union and autonomous republic acts of legislation.

3. The rules of the present article apply also to citizens' personal subsidiary plots.

Section III. Collective Ownership

Article 10. General Provisions Relating to Collective Ownership

1. Collective ownership includes ownership by leased enterprises, collective enterprises, cooperatives, joint-stock companies, economic societies and partnerships, economic associations, social organizations, and other associations that are legal entities.

2. Collective property is formed and augmented by transferring state enterprises to leasing, by granting working people's collectives the opportunity to use income received in order to purchase state property, by transforming state enterprises into joint-stock companies, and by voluntarily amalgamating the property of citizens and legal entities to create cooperatives, joint-stock companies, and other economic societies and partnerships.

Article 11. Ownership by Leased Enterprise

The leased enterprise owns the output produced, income received, and other property acquired with the resources of that enterprise.

The procedure and terms for participation by the members of the leased enterprise's labor collective in the management of its affairs and distribution of profits (revenue) are defined by USSR and union republic legislation on leasing.

Article 12. Ownership by Collective Enterprise

1. Ownership by collective enterprise arises in the event of the transfer of all the property of a state enterprise to the ownership of the labor collective, the purchase of leased property, or the acquisition of property by other methods envisaged by law.

The property of a collective enterprise, including output produced and income received, is the common property of its collective.

2. The investment of a collective enterprise's workers in the enterprise's property is to be determined. This investment includes the sum of the worker's investment in the property of the state or leased enterprise on the basis of which the collective enterprise was formed, and also the worker's investment in the growth of the enterprise's property subsequent to its creation.

The size of the worker's investment in the growth of the property is determined on the basis of his labor participation in the enterprise's activity.

Interest on the investment of a worker in a collective enterprise is calculated and paid at a rate determined by the labor collective on the basis of the results of the enterprise's economic activity.

The value of the investment is paid to a worker who has terminated labor relations with the enterprise, and also to the heirs of a deceased worker.

When a collective enterprise is wound up, the value of the investment is paid to the workers (their heirs) out of the property remaining after settlements with the budget, the banks, and the enterprise's other creditors.

Article 13. Ownership by Cooperative

1. The property of a cooperative is formed from its members' monetary and other material contributions,

the output it produces, the income received from sale of that output, and other activity envisaged by the cooperative's statutes.

2. When a cooperative is wound up the property remaining after settlements with the budget, the banks, and other creditors is distributed among the members of the cooperative.

Article 14. Ownership by Economic Society or Partnership

1. The property of economic societies and partnerships which are legal entities is formed from the investments of the participants and the property received as a result of economic activity or acquired on any other basis permitted by law.

2. The investment of the participant in an economic society or partnership can include fixed and circulating capital, money and securities, and also the rights to the use of property.

3. Enterprises, institutions, organizations, state organs, and also citizens can be participants in an economic society or partnership unless otherwise stipulated by acts of legislation of the USSR and union and autonomous republics.

Article 15. Ownership by Joint-Stock Company

1. A joint-stock company is the owner of the property created through the sale of shares and also received as a result of its economic activity or acquired by it on any other basis permitted by law.

2. Enterprises, institutions, organizations, and state organs can be shareholders.

Workers of the company in question, and also other citizens can be shareholders unless otherwise stipulated in acts of legislation of the USSR and union and autonomous republics or the company's statutes.

3. By joint decision of the labor collective and the duly empowered state organ a state enterprise can be transformed into a joint-stock company through the issue of shares to the full value of the enterprise's property. The money from the sale of shares, after the state enterprise's debts have been covered, is paid into the appropriate budget.

Article 16. Ownership by Economic Associations (Amalgamations)

1. An economic association of enterprises and organizations (including a concern or sectoral, intersectoral, or regional association) is entitled to own the property voluntarily transferred to it by enterprises and associations, and also received as a result of its economic activity.

2. An economic association does not have the right of ownership over the property of its member enterprises and organizations.

3. The property remaining after an economic association has ceased to function is distributed among its member enterprises and organizations.

Article 17. Ownership by Social Organizations and Funds

1. Social organizations, including charitable and other social funds, can own buildings, installations, housing, equipment, tools, property for cultural enlightenment and health purposes, money, shares, other securities, and other property necessary to provide material support for the activity envisaged by their statutes (charters). Social organizations (funds) can also own enterprises created in conformity with the aims indicated in their statutes (charters) with the resources of these organizations (funds).

2. Property remaining after a social organization (fund) is wound up is used for purposes envisaged by its statutes (charter).

Article 18. Ownership by Religious Organizations

Religious organizations can own buildings, religious objects, facilities for production, social, and charitable purposes, money, and other property necessary to ensure their activities.

Religious organizations have the right to own property acquired and created by them from their own resources, donated by citizens or organizations, or transferred by the state or acquired on any other basis envisaged by law.

Section IV. State Ownership

Article 19. General Provisions Relating to State Ownership

1. State property includes unionwide property, property of the union republics, property of autonomous republics, autonomous oblasts, and autonomous okrugs, and property of administrative-territorial formations (municipal property). The relevant soviets of people's deputies and state organs empowered by them dispose of and manage state property in the name of the people (population of the administrative-territorial formation).

By agreement among the owners of state property, that property can be in their common ownership.

2. Property created or acquired with budget or other resources of the USSR, union republic, autonomous republic, autonomous oblast, autonomous okrug, or administrative-territorial formation or the resources of enterprises, organizations, and institutions within their charge ranks respectively as unionwide property and property of the union republic, autonomous republic, autonomous oblast, autonomous okrug, or administrative-territorial formation.

3. The USSR is not liable for the obligations of union republics, autonomous republics, and autonomous formations, and union republics, autonomous republics,

autonomous formations, and administrative-territorial formations are not liable for the obligations of the USSR and one another's obligations.

Article 20. Ownership of Land and Other Natural Resources

1. The land and its subterranean resources, water, and flora and fauna are the inalienable property of the peoples living on the territory in question.

The union republic, autonomous republic, autonomous oblast, and autonomous okrug within the framework of USSR laws possess, use, and dispose of land and other natural resources on their own territory in their own interests and in the interests of the USSR. The autonomous republic, autonomous oblast, and autonomous okrug exercise these powers also in the interests of the union republic and within the framework of its laws.

Water and other natural resources on the territory of two or several union republics, autonomous republics, autonomous oblasts, or autonomous okrugs are used and disposed of by agreement among them, if necessary with the participation of the USSR.

2. The USSR (its organs and organizations) has possession and use of parcels of land and other natural facilities granted in order to ensure the activity of USSR organs of power and management, the USSR Armed Forces, border, internal, and railroad troops, main pipeline transportation, the USSR integrated power system, space systems, and unionwide communication and information systems, and also [granted] for use by other property ranked, according to Article 21 of the present law, as unionwide property by agreement between the USSR and the relevant union or autonomous republic.

The withdrawal of the aforementioned parcels of land and other natural facilities may be carried out with the consent of the USSR. The granting of new parcels of land and other natural facilities for possession and use by the USSR (its organs and organizations) is carried out by agreement between the USSR and the union republic, autonomous republic, autonomous oblast, or autonomous okrug.

3. The procedure for the granting by an autonomous republic, autonomous oblast, or autonomous okrug of parcels of land and other natural facilities to the union republic of which they form part in order to meet republic-wide requirements is determined by agreement between the relevant autonomous republic, autonomous oblast, or autonomous okrug and union republic.

4. Unionwide basic principles for the utilization and protection of natural resources are laid down by USSR legislation.

The procedure for granting land and other natural resources for possession and use is defined by the legislation of union and autonomous republics or, [when necessary] to meet unionwide and interrepublican requirements or for the defense and security of the country, is defined by legislation of the USSR and union and autonomous republics on the utilization and protection of natural resources.

5. Disputes arising between the USSR, union republics, autonomous republics, autonomous oblasts, and autonomous okrugs over the granting and utilization of land and other natural resources are examined by arbitration or other procedure laid down by law.

Article 21. Unionwide Ownership

The following are in unionwide ownership: Property of USSR organs of power and management, main gas pipeline transportation, the USSR integrated power system, space systems and unionwide communication and information systems, property of the USSR Armed Forces and border, internal, and railroad troops, defense facilities, all-union budget resources, the USSR State Bank and other USSR banks, and unionwide reserve, insurance, and other funds.

Unionwide ownership also applies to enterprises and national economic complexes in industry, the power industry, and construction, railroad, air, and maritime transportation, higher educational institutions of unionwide significance, and other property acquired with unionwide funds or transferred gratis to USSR ownership by union republics, autonomous republics, autonomous and administrative-territorial formations, citizens, and legal entities.

Article 22. Ownership by Union Republics, Autonomous Republics, Autonomous Oblasts, and Autonomous Okrugs

1. The following are in union republic ownership: The property of the union republic's organs of power and management, cultural and historical treasures of the union republic's peoples, republican budget resources, republican banks, republican insurance, reserve, and other funds, and also enterprises and national economic complexes and higher educational institutions of republican significance, facilities in the sociocultural sphere, and other property ensuring the republic's sovereignty, economic autonomy, and economic and social development.

2. The following are in the ownership of an autonomous republic, autonomous oblast, or autonomous okrug: The property of their organs of power and management, cultural and historical treasures of the peoples of the autonomous republic, autonomous oblast, or autonomous okrug, the resources of the relevant budget, the housing stock and housing and municipal amenities of the relevant soviet of people's deputies, and also agricultural, trade, everyday service, and transport enterprises, industrial, construction, and other enterprises and complexes, public education, cultural, and health care institutions, and other property ensuring the preservation of the material and spiritual culture of the peoples of the autonomous republics, autonomous oblasts, and autonomous okrugs, their economic and social development,

and the implementation of other tasks facing autonomous republics, autonomous oblasts, and autonomous okrugs.

Article 23. Ownership by Administrative-Territorial Formations (Municipal Ownership)

The ownership of a kray, oblast, rayon, or other administrative-territorial formation applies to the property of the administrative-territorial formation's organs of power and management, local budget resources, and the housing stock and housing and municipal amenities of the local soviet of people's deputies, and may also apply to agricultural, trade, and everyday service enterprises, transport, industrial, construction, and other enterprises and complexes, public education, cultural, and health care institutions, and other property necessary for economic and social development and the implementation of other tasks facing the relevant administrative-territorial formations.

Article 24. Property of the State Enterprise

1. State-owned property that is assigned to a state enterprise belongs to it on the basis of the right of full economic control.

In exercising the right of full economic control over its property, the enterprise possesses, utilizes, and disposes of the said property and at its own discretion carries out any actions with regard to it that do not contravene the law. The rules regarding the right of ownership apply to the right of full economic control unless stipulated otherwise by acts of legislation of the USSR and union and autonomous republics.

2. The state organs authorized to manage state property decide questions of creating the enterprise and defining the objectives of its activity, of reorganizing it, and of winding it up, monitor the efficiency of use and the safekeeping of the state property entrusted to it, and exercise other powers in accordance with legislative acts of the USSR and union and autonomous republics regarding the enterprise.

3. In the event of the adoption by a state organ authorized to manage state property of a decision to reorganize or wind up a state enterprise, except for cases where the enterprise is deemed insolvent (bankrupt), the labor collective is entitled to demand that the enterprise be leased or transformed into some other enterprise based on collective ownership. Disputes arising in such instances between the state organ and the labor collective are resolved by state arbitration.

Article 25. Ownership by Members of the Labor Collective of a State Enterprise

1. The profits remaining with the state enterprise after payment of taxes and other payments into the budget (the net profits) are at the disposal of the enterprise's labor collective. Some of these profits are transferred to the ownership of members of the labor collective under a procedure and in amounts defined by acts of legislation.

2. The sum of the profit belonging to a member of the labor collective forms his investment. The member of the labor collective can be issued with shares amounting to the sum of his investment.

The enterprise pays annual interest (dividends) on the investment (shares). The size of the portion of profits channeled into payment of interest (dividends) is determined by agreement between the enterprise administration and the labor collective.

3. With the consent of the member of the labor collective, the amount of his investment (in full or in part) can be used for the construction or acquisition of housing or other sociocultural facilities. Interest is not paid on the relevant amount of the investment.

The member of the labor collective is entitled to receive the sum of his investment (value of his shares) under a procedure and at a time determined by the joint decision of the administration and the labor collective.

When an enterprise is wound up the sum of their investments (value of their shares) is paid to members of the labor collective (their heirs) out of property remaining after settlements with the budget, banks, and the enterprise's other creditors.

Article 26. Property of a State Institution

1. State-owned property that is assigned by the owner to a state institution (organization) maintained out of the state budget is in the operational control of that institution (organization).

2. State institutions (organizations) maintained out of the state budget and able, in cases laid down by acts of legislation of the USSR and union and autonomous republics, to carry out economic activity acquire the right to dispose independently of the revenue from that activity and of the property acquired with that revenue.

3. The state institution (organization) bears liability for its obligations in the form of the money at its disposal. Where the state institution (organization) lacks sufficient funds, the liability for its obligations is borne by the owner of the relevant property.

Section V. Ownership by Joint Ventures, Foreign Citizens, Organizations, and States

Article 27. Ownership by Joint Ventures

Joint ventures with the participation of Soviet legal entities and foreign legal entities and citizens are created on the territory of the USSR in the form of joint-stock companies and economic societies and partnerships and can own property necessary in order to carry out the activity envisaged by their constituent documents.

Article 28. Ownership by Foreign Citizens

The provisions of the present law relating to ownership by Soviet citizens also apply to foreign citizens' property in the USSR. The provisions regarding ownership by a

peasant farm or other labor partnership apply to ownership by foreign citizens residing permanently in the USSR.

Article 29. Ownership by Foreign Legal Entities

Foreign legal entities are entitled to own on USSR territory industrial and other enterprises, buildings, installations, and other property for purposes of carrying out economic and other activity in instances and under a procedure laid down by USSR acts of legislation.

Article 30. Ownership by Foreign States and International Organizations

Foreign states and international organizations are entitled to own on USSR territory property necessary to carry out diplomatic, consular, and other international relations in instances and under a procedure laid down by international treaties and acts of legislation of the USSR and union republics.

Section VI. Guarantees and Protection of the Right of Ownership

Article 31. Guarantees of the Right of Ownership

1. The state guarantees the stability of ownership relations established in accordance with the present law.

2. In the event of the adoption by the USSR or a union or autonomous republic of acts of legislation terminating a right of ownership, the losses incurred by the owner as a result of the adoption of these acts, by decision of the court, are reimbursed to the owner in full by the USSR or the relevant union or autonomous republic.

3. The state ensures in legislation equal conditions for the protection of the right of ownership for citizens, organizations, and other owners.

Article 32. Protection of the Right of Ownership

1. An owner is entitled to demand the return of his property from the illegal possession of another party in accordance with the civil legislation of the USSR and union and autonomous republics.

2. An owner can demand the elimination of any violations of his right even if these violations were not associated with deprivation of possession.

3. The courts, State Board of Arbitration, or arbitration protect the right of ownership.

4. The rights provided by the present article also belong to a person who, though not the owner, possesses property on the basis of the right of full economic control, operational control, lifetime heritable possession, or other basis provided by law or contract. That person has the right to protection of his possession also against an owner.

Article 33. Protection of the Owner's Interests When His Rights Are Terminated on Grounds Provided by Law

1. Termination of the right of ownership in connection with a decision on the withdrawal of the parcel of land on which a house, other structures, installations, or plants belonging to an owner stand or other decision by a state organ not directly aimed at taking property from an owner is permitted only in instances and under a procedure laid down by acts of legislation of the USSR and union and autonomous republics, the owner being reimbursed in full for the losses incurred as a result of the termination of the right of ownership.

If the owner disagrees, a decision entailing termination of the right of ownership cannot be implemented until the dispute has been resolved by the court, State Board of Arbitration, or arbitration. All questions of reimbursing the owner for losses incurred are also resolved when the dispute is examined.

2. The state may take property from an owner only in applying a lien on that property in connection with the owner's obligations in instances and under a procedure laid down by acts of legislation of the USSR and union and autonomous republics, and also by way of requisition and confiscation.

In the event of natural disasters, accidents, epidemics, and epizootics and in other exceptional circumstances, property can be taken from an owner in the interests of society by decision of the organs of state power under a procedure and on terms laid down by acts of legislation of the USSR and union and autonomous republics, the owner being paid the value of the property (requisition).

In instances envisaged by acts of legislation of the USSR and union and autonomous republics, property can be taken from an owner by decision of the court, State Board of Arbitration, or other competent state organ (official) by way of sanction for the commission of a crime or other offense (confiscation).

Article 34. Invalidity of Acts Violating the Rights of Owners

If the rights of an owner and other persons with regard to possession, use, or disposal of property belonging to them are violated as a result of the promulgation of an unlawful act by an organ of state management or local organ of state power, that act is deemed null and void at the suit of the owner or person whose rights have been violated.

The losses incurred by citizens, organizations, and other persons as a result of the promulgation of the aforementioned acts are to be reimbursed in full from the funds at the disposal of the relevant organ of power or management.

[Signed] USSR Supreme Soviet Chairman M. Gorbachev

[Dated] The Kremlin, Moscow, 6 March 1990.

PRAVDA Hails Creation of Presidency

PM1903113590 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 19 Mar 90 Second Edition p 1

[PRAVDA editorial: "Crucial Landmark"]

[Text] The extraordinary Third Congress of USSR People's Deputies will undoubtedly be assigned a special place in our history. The congress made decisions of a truly historic dimension, bound up with radical changes in the structure of the supreme echelons of power and in the basic law of our life and with the introduction of the institution of president. Those decisions constitute a crucial landmark in the development of our society and state.

The third congress was, as people know, an extraordinary one. But people have described it among themselves as an emergency one.

Yes, let us acknowledge in good conscience that a real emergency situation does exist in the country. The grave economic situation, which has introduced the word "crisis" into our vocabulary, has been exacerbated of late by separatist aspirations in a number of republics, by outbreaks of interethnic strife, by strikes and rising crime. However, these negative phenomena have not met with a proper response or appropriate decisions in the new organs of management.

But is it worth putting the blame for this on the party, the perestroyka initiated by it, or a parliament which has for the first time actually been created by expression of the people's will?

Let us remember the following: For many years political practice was based on the primacy of the interests of the state over those of people. During that time we began to forget that the plan, new construction, and peace on earth are required above all in order that people may be people. In order that their material and spiritual wealth may grow and that they be firmly convinced of the observance of their legitimate interests, rights, and freedoms. But they were deprived of this by the reality they experienced wherein the zealous promotion of state interests was frequently used to justify arbitrary acts and the violation of citizens' constitutional rights, and the center's disregard of the needs of the regions.

On embarking on the course of perestroyka the party has resolutely rejected such an approach as incompatible with socialist ideals and contrary to the principles of humane, democratic socialism. The concepts of the rule-of-law state and a self-managing society have been advanced instead.

The creation of true people's organs of power—the USSR Supreme Soviet and the Congress of USSR People's Deputies—have embodied this course of deepening democratization. Discharging the will of the people, they first occupied themselves, and rightly so, with instilling order in our legislation, since it is precise laws rather than big talk that are needed for the transfer of real power to the people. Legal safeguards rather than a labyrinth of departmental edicts are required to put the economy onto a basis of true economic accountability and autonomy. And, of course, if the rights, interests, and freedoms of the citizen are to be observed, it is not just a renewed USSR Constitution but also a legal mechanism for exercising the principles proclaimed in it that is required.

However, after getting down seriously to legislative work, we forgot at some point that it needs to be buttressed by firm executive power. After all, democracy in a rule-of-law state means not just expanding real rights and freedoms but also strengthening responsibility, discipline, and organization.

Meanwhile the slogans of democratization, glasnost, and expanding people's rights and freedoms became increasingly exploited by motley groups of people who, while pretending to be champions of perestroyka, are in actual fact its sworn opponents by virtue of their convictions or actions. Exploiting the current situation in the country and the spontaneously growing politicization of the masses, and not encountering any resolute resistance, they are sowing the seeds of civil disobedience in the people, are destabilizing the political and economic situation in the country, and are conducting overt anti-Soviet propaganda.

Is this really compatible with the principles of a rule-of-law state? Here we should be talking about a direct breach of legality, the undermining of the bases of our society, and accountability for this. Such is what our laws demand. But when the executive power is ineffective, then the laws too are inoperative.

It was in such an emergency situation—let us repeat ourselves—that the extraordinary Third Congress of USSR People's Deputies was convened. Has it helped us take a step toward stability and future changes for the better?

The answer, clearly, is unambiguous: Yes! First and foremost because the decisions taken at the congress have at last effected the separation of legislative, executive, and judicial powers essential in a rule-of-law state, and have defined the place and role of party and public associations by restoring their autonomy and self-managing principles. At the same time, by introducing a new form of state rule by establishing the post of president of the USSR, the congress has created an institution that coordinates the three autonomous powers and has introduced personalized responsibility for the situation in the country.

Much has already been said recently, particularly at the congress, about the role of the presidency and the necessity of its introduction. However, this step was not so much dictated by present-day realities as being designed for the future and the rule-of-law state. The creation of the post of president was brought about, as the draft CPSU Central Committee Platform stresses, by the need to maintain the stable development of the country, to

impart greater dynamism to perestroyka, to enshrine safeguards of its irreversability, to ensure the normal and effective functioning of all state and public institutions, and to defend the interests of the USSR and the representation of our state in the international arena.

The extensive powers vested in the president of the USSR by the congress are legislatively balanced by the opportunities for monitoring his activity exercised by the Congress of USSR People's Deputies and the USSR Supreme Soviet, and also by the glasnost and political pluralism which are now a reality.

M.S. Gorbachev's speech was also followed with special attention in this respect, too—because of the exceptional importance and crucial nature of the fundamental decisions taken by the congress. Not just because this was the first speech of the first president in our history. But primarily because it contained a realistic program for the country's further development, for overcoming the present, grave difficulties, and for protecting perestroyka and democracy.

The mere fact of instituting the post of president of the USSR renders the extraordinary Third Congress of People's Deputies a historic one. But its significance, one feels, is due not just to the introduction of a new form of state rule. The third congress has not just taken a step toward stability in the state but is also a breakthrough toward new heights in the democratization of society.

Yes, that means the amendments and additions to Articles 6 and 7 of the USSR Constitution, which were initiated by the party. The concepts of "ruling party" and "leading social force" have been deleted from the text of the Constitution. The Communist Party, having opened the way to a multiparty system, has itself renounced the monopoly of power and is ready for cooperation and political dialogue with all who advocate the renewal of socialist society. Henceforth, each party, organization, or association of citizens will occupy in sociopolitical life the position determined by its political weight and the people's support.

Consequently, the Communist Party faces major tasks. It must learn how to work and operate in the new conditions of political pluralism. Having renounced he monopoly of power, it must win the people's vote of confidence. The amendments and additions to the USSR Constitution on questions of the political system approved on the CPSU's initiative are a step toward winning that confidence.

The congress was also significant for the fact that it outlined the prospects for reinforcing the sovereignty of the people. With the institution of the presidency, the Supreme Soviet is not only not weakened but becomes far stronger as the supreme legislative organ. By transferring some functions to the USSR president it will be able to channel the potential thus released into lawmaking and stepping up its monitoring duties. The chambers—the Soviet of the Union and the Soviet of Nationalities—will be able to act far more vigorously so as to express and discuss all-union and national interests from two sides.

Perestroyka is now being subjected to serious trials. But the extraordinary congress showed that our people and their elected deputies have sufficient wisdom, courage, and strength to counter any attacks on the course of democratization and the renewal of society.

We now have a president, a Supreme Soviet that is gaining in strength, and a congress that expresses the will of the people. With the Soviet people's support, those bodies are the guarantor of democracy based on the primacy of the law, the guarantor of the irreversibility of perestroyka, and the guarantor of the observance of man's rights, freedoms, and interests. That is another conclusion which may be drawn from the extraordinary Third Congress of USSR People's Deputies, which was a milestone in the development of our society and state.

Nationalists Win Parliamentary Poll

AU1903123090 Paris AFP in English 1221 GMT 19 Mar 90

[Text] Moscow, March 19 (AFP)—Nationalists took more than half the seats in the Baltic republic's parliament in a first-round weekend election marked by a high voter turnout, preliminary results released Monday showed.

But voters in the three biggest Soviet republics, the Russian Federation, Belorussia and the Ukraine, showed little interest in local elections Sunday, although reformers gained ground.

Turnout was estimated at about 60 percent in the vote for the parliaments of the three republics, as well as neighbourhood and municipal councils, though no official figures were available Monday. Some districts will have to go back to the polls as their elections were declared invalid because fewer than 50 percent of the electorate turned out.

In Moscow, turnout was 56 percent, according to a member of the election commission. Two Communist Party apparatchiks, Party Chief Yuriy Prokofiyev and Mayor Valeriy Saikin were elected to the city council Sunday.

In Latvia, however, where demands for secession from the Soviet Union are growing in the wake of Lithuania's declaration of independence last week, turnout was 80 percent.

According to preliminary results published by TASS news agency, 171 members of the republic's 201-seat parliament won majorities in the first round, which means runoff votes will not be held in their constituencies.

A spokesman for the nationalist Popular Front contacted by telephone in Riga, the Latvian capital, said the front

could count on the support of 121 of the newly elected members of parliament. TASS said the front's candidates had won 108 seats.

In Leningrad, where only 30 candidates won seats on the municipal council in the first round on March 4, leaving 370 seats to be filled, another vote will have to be held in nearly 70 of the city's districts where voter turnout failed to reach the legal minimum of 50 percent, reformist leader Yuriy Nesterov told AGENCE FRANCE-PRESSE.

Even so, reformers scored a major victory in the municipal election, and the city council can start work immediately as two-thirds of the councillors have been elected, Mr. Nesterov said.

Some 220 of the 300-odd councillors elected Sunday belong to the pro-reform Democratic Russia group, said Mr. Nesterov, who was himself elected both to the city council and the local parliament.

In the Ukraine, candidates of the Democratic Bloc, a nationalist- reformist coalition, won a landslide victory in Kiev, the capital, taking 16 of the city's 22 seats in the republic's parliament.

Members of Rukh, the nationalist party which is the main force in the coalition, said they were sure to win most of the seats in Lvov, the major city in western Ukraine.

Ukranian party chief Vladimir Ivachko beat the Democratic Bloc candidate in his constituency in a Kiev suburb. But Rukh claimed that he was only elected because soldiers on weekend manoeuvres near the city had voted in the poll. Soviet television said some 12,000 soldiers on maneuvres had voted.

Elections in Baltics Viewed; Siberian Turnout Low

LD1903001190 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1530 GMT 18 Mar 90

[From the "Seven Days" program]

[Text] Elections are being held to the Republican Supreme Soviets today in Latvia and Estonia. In Estonia the population is divided into two parts according to political conviction. One part sees Estonia as an independent state in the near-future, no longer a part of the Soviet Union, while the others wish to retain the status of a Union Republic.

The following figures are available for Latvia: 390 candidates are contesting 201 seats in the republican parliament; only one candidate is standing in each of 48 constituencies; 69 percent of the candidates are members of the Communist Party, and 49 of the Latvian People's Front. Social Democrats and Greens are standing too, as are two priests.

How we are to live in the next five years effectively depends on the results of today's elections, and on how active we are. However, reports have come in to the Central Electoral Committee that today's voter turnout is lower than that of two weeks ago. In the towns of western Siberia, for example, there are constituencies where voter turnout has been less than 40 percent. We will know the exact figures and just how the elections are concluded in a few days.

Official Examines Cost of February Demonstrations

PM1603165090 Moscow MOSCOW NEWS in English No 10, 11 Mar 90 p 6

[Unattributed interview with Moscow City Soviet Executive Committee Vice Chairman D.G. Chernik; date, place not given: "Money Versus Democracy"; first paragraph is editorial introduction]

[Text] On March 2 the newspaper "Moskovskaya Pravda" featured an interview with D.G. Chernik, Vice-Chairman of the Executive Committee of the Moscow City Soviet. The latter said that the "losses" incurred because of the meeting held on February 25 were estimated to be around 338,000 rubles. The text of the interview and the figures cited in it are so interesting that it is worth taking a closer look at them.

D. Chernik: What cost the most was the maintenance of law and order—an additional spending of 258,700 rubles. This includes wages for an additional contingent of militiamen, and the wage fund for members of public order squads who will be given compensation for working on their day off.

MN: If we consider that everyone additionally ensured the maintenance of law and order on February 25 was paid an average of ten rubles (this is higher than the national average daily wage), then the meeting was patroled by 25,800 people. Who determined the numerical strength of the additional contingent? Wasn't it excessive? Weren't ten or five thousand enough, for example?

D. Chernik: The additional expenditures on transport and the losses sustained by mass transport organizations because of the closure of routes amounted to 58,400.

MN: What does it mean—additional expenditures on transport? What kind of transport? The transport of marchers, militiamen and public order volunters? What portion of the losses was caused due to the changing of routes? If every participant in the meeting (let's use the minimum figure—100,000 people) came and left by Metro, this alone must have provided an additional earning of 10,000 rubles to the Metro network. And in our city, hardly anyone can get to the centre from home solely with the help of the Metro. If, as we have been told, public transport doesn't pay its way in Moscow, the "closing of routes" doesn't mean bigger losses, but rather a reduction.

D. Chernik: The public health services lost 18,400 roubles on the organization of additional teams of medical workers, and the reserving of hospital beds.

MN: What part of the daily expenditures on Moscow health care do these 18,400 represent? Does the "organization of additional teams" mean that on February 25 fewer ambulances responded to calls for help? It will be recalled that people are not hospitalized or discharged from our hospitals on Sunday. How many beds were released, and on whose account, on Sunday?

D. Chernik: Add to this the loss of 2,500 in profit at Gorkiy Park.

MN: Evidently, on that day Gorkiy Park had no need to keep the number of militiamen and public order volunteers usual for a Sunday, and to clean the territory after visitors. What a saving this added up to?

D. Chernik: The treasury did not receive 4 million rubles from the sale of goods and due to the closure of public catering enterprises.

MN: Practically all the stores which sell manufactured goods do not work anyway on Sundays. How many such shops were closed, what kind and where? Wasn't it advisable—considering the duration of the meeting and the large crowds of people—to open additional public catering centres instead of closing down the few existing ones?

D. Chernik: The cost of a meeting in Luzhniki is less than a procession in the city's centre because there is no need to close down shops and it's easier to ensure people's safety.

MN: If that is the case, wouldn't it be better to hold May Day and November 7 demonstrations in Luzhniki? Or maybe in a desert? How much, incidentally, do the May and November demonstrations cost our country, Moscow and enterprises, considering the need to manufacture paper flowers, new uniforms each time for "exercisers", to close transport routes, etc?

D. Chernik: No matter where a meeting may take place, it brings appreciable loses to the city.... And all of us have to compensate for these losses.

MN: One should presume that "losses" may also include the cost of conducting elections, the maintenance of the Supreme Soviet and the convocations of the Congresses of People's Deputies. Does this mean that such activities, "unprofitable" as they are for the treasure, should not be carried out at all? Or should they better be replaced with amusements at Gorkiy Park? After all, we're talking about 2,500 roubles a day.

And in general, in the opinion of the Vice-Chairman of the Executive Committee of the Moscow City Soviet, how much does support for a democratic perestroyka cost? If possible, in rubles....

Economic

Party Official Interviewed on Strike Situation

904F0101A Moscow RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA in Russian 8 Mar 90 p 2

[Interview with A.G. Melnikov, first Secretary of the Kemerovo Oblast CPSU Committee, by A. Parshintsev, RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA correspondent in Kemerovo; date and place not specified: "Stepping Back From the Brink"]

[Text] In July of last year, the sparks of dissatisfaction with the slow progress of perestroyka burst in the Kuzbass. A lot of time has passed since; it has embraced a major event, the February (1990) Plenum of the CPSU Central Committee. However, to this day the readers ask in their letters: What is the situation in the Kuzbass at present? What does the future hold in store? Today, our correspondent A. Parshintsev discusses this with Aleksandr Grigoryevich Melnikov, first secretary of the Kemerovo Oblast party committee.

[Parshintsev] I recall the hot days of 1989, at the House of Culture Mayakovskiy in Novokuznetsk where you together with Minister [of the Coal Industry] M. Shchadov engaged in a dialogue with members of the strike committees of striking cities. The situation was extremely tense. Your attempts to state your position frequently drew catcalls and hisses. How do you view these events at present?

[Melnikov] I will admit that the events of these days and what followed continue to keep my mind tense. Whether I accept the strike as a whole or in part is not the issue. The strike has taken place. I will also ignore the aspect of personal inferiority and powerlessness. A mighty new movement from the grassroots to which we are not accustomed prompts party functionaries to resolutely revise established views and positions.

Grasping the need for speeding up fundamental perestroyka, including in the party, is the first point which I came to realize in the square in which passions raged. Immediately after the strike, I submitted to the obkom [oblast committee of the party] a proposal on reports by the raykoms [rayon committees], gorkom [city committee], and obkom of the party at conferences but I did not gain their support which I now regret: I had to go all the way, including a statement on my resignation. However, at the time I did not bring myself to do this. This is how I reasoned: Do I, a person who has just assumed the post, have a right to resign the appointment, sort of desert, under these most complex circumstances? Having established contacts with the strike committees and attempted to grasp the enormity of what was happening, I tried to make sure that the essence of the workers' movement is given serious consideration in the oblast party organization, the obkom, and the Central Committee. I reported this to the Department of Organizationa' and Party Work and Cadre Policy.

In December, at the plenum of the Central Committee, I once again tried to draw attention to the new phenomenon and said that we cannot ascribe the demands of workers to mercenary motives only. The thrust of the movement was different: to support perestroyka. The party should lean on the workers' movement, it should head it. The February Plenum of the Central Committee summed it up: The workers' movement needs the support of the party, and the party needs its support.

[Parshintsev] As is known, in December of last year an ultimatum, an appeal of "the four"—the council of workers' collectives, the party obkom, the oblast Executive Committee, and the oblast trade union council—was sent to the government of our country. It referred to the economic and social policy still implemented with regard to the Kuzbass as "colonial." The demand was made to the government to meet again in Prokopyevsk. Did you sign the appeal on the basis of your firm conviction or under pressure from the councils of workers' collectives?

[Melnikov] At the end of the year, a dangerous situation was developing in the Kuzbass: The deadline for the fulfillment of the protocol signed in July by the strike committees and the government commission was close. However, there still was no certainty with regard to its main points—granting the region and the enterprises economic independence and social development. By this time, the leaders of the workers' movement had acquired considerable experience "communicating" with the central organs of power which at the last stage attempted to put the demands of strike committees on the back burner. A conflict was obvious. Having returned from the December plenum of the Central Committee I signed the appeal to the government without doubting that the "committee people" were right.

Results followed: the USSR and RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] Councils of Ministers adopted important decrees on the Kuzbass in an expedited manner—on switching to the principles of self-management and self-financing in the region, and on its social development. A government commission also came to the oblast.

[Parshintsev] In the opinion of the council of workers' committees, this commission accomplished a lot; however, the "committee people" did not sign the final document justifying their step by the failure of the package of government decrees to provide for a mechanism of self-management and self-financing. They offered their program to the commission, but the latter considered it to be excessive and premature. What is your position?

[Melnikov] Initially, I doubted the harshness of the decision of the workers' committees: They should have signed the protocol. Once a document is signed it begins to take effect. They could settle on the program proposed in the course of the proceedings. However, after a conversation with members of the committees I came to see a certain positive sense of it. Why? As I see it, the government should work looking at tomorrow, and should not restrict itself to half-measures. It should grasp businesslike proposals keenly.

After all, the goal of the workers' program is to enhance the reform; the latter is a component of the July protocol. Many of its provisions could be tested within a year in one region, and some specific results could be obtained. We should be prepared for others raising in the future the issues of prices for coal, the market, the transfer of enterprises reporting to the union to local soviets of people deputies, and currency. These issues could be resolved taking our experience into account. We will have gained it in a year.

[Parshintsev] Let us assume that the demands of the workers' committees are going to be accepted by the government. Then the mundane question of "what next" will become as acute as can be. How is the economic and social impasse to be overcome in the region? Does the obkom have its creative program, or does it support the program of the Union of Kuzbass Toilers?

[Melnikov] At present, the word "work," especially in combination with the word "intensive," is extremely unpopular in our society. Unfortunately, like many other notions, it has depreciated due to its frequent thoughtless use. However, I am convinced that for us there is no getting away from the notion of "creative labor." This is what we badly need at present! I see the task of party committees and primary organizations in vigorously assisting the establishment of economic accountability relations in the production collectives of the lower echelon—this is where the main point is at present for applying ourselves; this is where workers' democracy should grow stronger. This is why the issue of staffing various echelons with intelligent, knowledgeable managers has been made a priority. Many of them have been discovered by the workers' movement. I am convinced that the forthcoming reports-and-elections campaign in the party organizations will shake up the structure of party committees and will promote the people who are worthy of our time. Judging by the list of candidates, local soviets will also be renewed perceptibly by taking in the people who are involved and reliable.

There are no essential differences between the platforms of the Central Committee, the party obkom, and the Union of Kuzbass Toilers. We will act together. The main point is to speed up perestroyka! However, a dialogue is necessary: Our specific endeavors will advance in the direction desired if we come to terms thoroughly with all social movements and understand each other completely.

[Parshintsev] These rumors are circulating: come May and the warm weather the workers will shake up the country with their new might. Do you feel that there are prerequisites for new strikes in the Kuzbass?

[Melnikov] Objective reasons do exist. The Kuzbass started the new year badly; there are no incentives for

good labor: The counters of grocery shops are barren, and the shortage of consumer necessities is as acute as can be. However, let us be sensible: Does it make sense to "shake" the country like a pear tree, the fruit of which have long fallen? It is much more important to take care of the tree and spare no effort for it to bear fruit.

I am profoundly convinced that neither the working people nor the workers' committees need a new strike. The residents of the Kuzbass have now been given a realistic opportunity to step back from the brink, toward independence and creative work. I believe that the government will go along with the program proposed by the workers' committees. At present, a conflict resolution commission is at work in Moscow.

AFTERWORD TO THE INTERVIEW. This article was ready to be filed at the editorial office when an enigmatic rumor spread: On the day of the obkom plenum, a rally will be held in the square before the obkom; its participants will demand that the party leaders resign. However, I still did not get to see a single person with a poster or a megaphone in the square. The city went about its everyday business.

Instead, the plenum "made noise." Member of the obkom V. Andreyev expressed his lack of confidence in A. Melnikov and demanded his resignation. In his closing statement, Aleksandr Grigoryevich also raised the issue of his resignation in conjunction with retirement. The party aktiv rejected the resignation of "the first."

Several days later, the conflict resolution commission came back from Moscow; it was represented by members of the council of workers' committees, experts, employees of the oblast Executive Committee and the CPSU obkom. The program of the workers' committees calling for putting in place a mechanism of self-management and self-financing at the regional level was rejected with [as published] Deputy Chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers L. Ryabev.

Two days ago, the council of workers' committees resolved to embark on vigorous work in all production collectives with a view to escaping the control of ministries and departments.

Payment of Bribes by Cooperatives Discussed

PM1603140390 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
16 Mar 90 Second Edition p 4

[Article by Ye. Sorokin: ""Bureaucrat's Racket"]

[Text] Corruption and bribery.... Just recently it was believed that these social defects did not exist in our society and if something of the kind did sometimes happen, as a rule this was presented as a single negative instance. The beam of glasnost has lifted the curtain over secrecy but has so far failed to illuminate the full scale of the evil.

The cooperative movement which has appeared has muddled the cards of the law enforcement organs. Now they are increasingly frequently having to answer the complex question of when it is a case of a bribe from a "free enterpreneur" and when it is a simple payment for a "consultation." A dangerous erosion of the border between crime and "business" is beginning.

...A strange visitor once came to see I. Timofeyev, former chairman of Moscow's "Terem" cooperative. He called himself a representative of "a plant near Moscow." He set forth the thrust of his proposal. Back in the years of stagnation the plant's director had begun to build a hunting lodge for himself and higher ranking bosses. Actually, as it turned out, it was not a lodge but a whole house. But soon, however, the plant labor collective council learned of it and faced the director with a dilemma: He could either leave his post or turn the prestigious private house into a rest home. But the director decided not to turn to his own construction workers—he sent a loyal employee to the construction cooperative. The estimated cost of the work was just 15,000 rubles [R], the state organization would not take more. But the cooperative could charge four times more. So it was suggested to Timofeyev that R30,000 be given to the cooperative and that the remaining R30,000 be divided equally between him and the director.

Timofeyev, describing this episode, adds:

"Alas, that is not the first time I have been offered dubious 'operations.' People only have to learn that you are a cooperative member and immediately there are hints. Often they even 'work' openly. They ask for a mother-in-law or fiancee to be 'fixed up' in the cooperative or even simply demand the payment of a monthly bribe in cash. I arrive at a timber processing combine for timber. The director sets the condition that I pay him R300 a month. I turn and go. But I already know that tomorrow I will give in to him anyway."

All these episodes are united by a new concept which appeared recently—"bureaucratic racketeering." It differs from outright extortion and bribery only in its unbridled shamelessness and, despite everything, its virtual legal status. They have even managed to set "rates" for services. Thus, for a cubic meter of board you have to give an additional R10, for a cubic meter of mobile hut ["vagonka"] the price is R25-30, and for a cubic meter of girder R20, and so forth. At a meeting with journalists V. Korchagin, president of the "Rossiya" association, once announced: "For one square meter of leased premises you have to give a bribe of R100-150." Timofeyev specified: "Now the price is always R300."

These requisitions are not simply a crime by bureaucrats. Essentially power as such—administrative, economic, legal, and other—is being sold off. Corruption has seen rich pickings in the cooperative trough.

Until recently, I was told at the Russian Ministry of Finance, it was possible to take a bribe from cooperatives completely legally. Many economic leaders either headed them or became ordinary cooperative members. The USSR Ministry of Finance sounded the alarm. An instruction was issued banning this apology for combined office. But only after October last year, when the Supreme Soviet banned activity of this kind for officials did a great deal settle down.

It is true that to this day the editorial office receives letters from those who, in their opinion, have been wrongly deprived of revenue. But let's look at what was being done before. There was a very large number of these dubious situations. For instance, according to the figures of the financial organs, the "Interyer" cooperative, created under the Saratov RPU [expansion unknown] of consumer services, for several months paid the RPU chief, L. Fiskind, R120 a month "for consultations." Similar cases also occurred in Kuybyshev. And not only in that city. For instance, in Severodvinsk a cooperative created under the communications center was headed by....the chief of the communications center.

And it was quite customary for leaders of guarantor enterprises to join the staff of a cooperative. Here are the figures for Moscow alone. B. Khoroshukhin, deputy chief engineer of the "Mosstroy-14" trust, was at the same time chairman of the "From and To" cooperative. (He has now left state service). A. Medvedev, chief engineer of the same trust's No. 668 construction administration, was for several months a "worker under contract" to the "From and To" cooperative. I. Prokofyev, chief of the "Mosgorvtorresursy" association's capital construction department, was at one time a member of the "Rossiya" cooperative, which carried out general construction work and capital repairs. But, I was told at the association, the cooperative did not keep its word, overspent, and did not carry out the work. The association incurred losses. And then I. Prokofyev left state service to head a new cooperative—"Pirita." The most incomprehensible thing is that it was the same association which acted as his guarantor.

But far from everyone has taken note of the USSR Supreme Soviet resolution. Here is an example. V. Makhlin, chief of workshop No. 37 at the "Siluet" Moscow City Production Association, was elected chairman of the "Tent" cooperative, which sews outer garments. "Tent's" guarantor was one of the factories of the "Siluet" association.

I often hear cooperatives say: We do not want to buy anyone, it is simply that there are very many people who want to sell themselves. And if you do not buy, it costs you more...

Here is a letter to PRAVDA from Kazakhstan. Two cooperatives have been created in the quarry where the letter's author works. Both were allocated the best, most profitable sectors and productive equipment. And they gathered together almost all the director's relatives. The letter's author also decided to create a cooperative. "The director did not officially refuse me," he reports. "But for some reason the rayispolkom [rayon soviet executive committee] delayed registration for several months. Only when I promised the quarry director a substantial sum was everything resolved immediately. At the local administration of the Industrial Construction Bank the manager demanded that we give him a post as consultant. One of the association's chief specialists, who works with us under contract for a wage of R150, is demanding a further R500 a month."

These situations unfortunately cannot be called the exception to the rule. And they are all the result of the fact that in the country until recently there were no clear legal norms regulating the activity of state employees under the new conditions. After all, throughout virtually the entire civilized world state employees have long been forbidden to work in private and cooperative offices, organizations, and institutions. Of course, the decision adopted by the Supreme Soviet will halt the open fleecing of cooperative members. But how many secret deals have not been revealed here!

That is why the alarm remains. Recently the powers of the local soviets and enterprises with regard to cooperatives have become really unrestricted. Now executive committees control prices for articles and determine the size of tax. And that is right: which cooperatives are needed can be seen better locally. But control over the activity of cooperatives should be exercised not by representatives of the executive committees, not by the apparatus, but by deputies' commissions, whose decisions come into force only after approval by a soviet session.

This situation, after stormy debates in parliament, has finally become the legislative norm. But it will hardly set a limit to racketeering by bureaucrats if the silent majority continues to dominate even in the renewed soviets. So, whether we want it or not, the normalization of our life and the eradication of corruption from it are directly linked with voters' activeness in the present election campaign and, if you like, with their political feeling.

But that is only one side of the coin. The opportunity for giving bribes is provided by the existence of "real live" money. But the cooperatives cannot manage without this money—the State Bank is too slow and works according to the old ways. But why then should they not open their own cooperative bank? And these banks are being created, but they are being subjected to all kinds of frustration even while they are being established.

If we seriously intend to struggle against corruption then glasnost is needed in everything. Take the leasing of premises, for instance. Why should we not organize the auctioning of empty premises and not have a catalog of such premises in every city? The soviets could make considerable amounts of money out of this.

Such glasnost is also essential in material and technical supplies. Essentially we do not yet have wholesale trade in our country. But these same soviets are in no hurry to organize auctions for the sale of lumber and construction materials, technology and equipment, and so forth.

It is surprising that many cooperative members are afraid of glasnost: Criminal racketeers will start to plague us if they find out our incomes, they say. I think the reason lies elsewhere—secrecy often covers up dark deeds connected with bureaucratic racketeering which is sometimes more terrible than the gun. But surely this is not a matter where neither people's nor workers' control can check up on the cooperative? Where the cooperative's revenue is kept a closely guarded secret and only the financial inspector has the right to demand the financial documents? Where even the press quite often encounters the strange prohibition—"commercial secret?"

But these are all only half measures in the struggle for a healthy cooperative movement until the main question has been resolved—until the rights of the two types of ownership are made equal. In every respect—in deliveries of materials, the leasing of premises, the sum deducted from the state budget, and prices. Only then will the cooperative movement become what we expect of it. We have been waiting for three years now. The state is waiting, but the official bribe takers have not been wasting their time.

Agricultural

Agricultural Developments for 1-7 March Noted

LD0803043890

[Editorial Report] The following is a compilation of reports on agricultural developments in the USSR carried by Moscow Domestic Service in Russian on 1-7 March, unless indicated otherwise. Times of broadcast, given in GMT, are in parentheses at the end of each item.

1 March

Sowing of early potatoes in Surkhandarinskaya Oblast is complete and the area of land sown to this crop there has been tripled. (1400)

Selective sowing of spring grain and early feed crops has begun in Stavropolskiy Kray. (1400)

2-3 March

No notable developments.

4 March

Sowing of spring crops has started in the southern rayons of Rostov Oblast. (1400)

5 March

No notable developments.

6 March

Potato fields have been expanded because of contracting cotton fields. Last year potatoes were grown on only 26,500 hectares in the republic. This year potatoes will be grown on 60,000 hectares of land. (Tashkent Domestic Service in Uzbek 0215 GMT 6 Mar 90)

7 March

No notable developments.

Public Poll Indicates Majority Approve Land Law

LD1103094890 Moscow World Service in English 0800 GMT 11 Mar 90

[Text] Most of the Soviet people feel that rural residents should be fully free to choose forms of farming. This was revealed by a public opinion poll devoted to the approval of the laws on property and land aimed at radical changes in economic relations in the country. During the debates on laws many leaders of agricultural cooperatives and state farms spoke against them. Yet, as the poll shows, the laws are supported by the people. In the opinion poll 59 percent of the participants in that poll believed farmers should be independent in deciding whether to stay in collective farms or set up a farm of their own.

Late Weather, Crop Conditions Reported

Late-January, Early February

904B0164A Moscow SELSKAYA ZHIZN in Russian 4 Feb 90 p 2

[Article by Ye. Solovyeva, agrometeorologist: "Weather and Crops"]

[Text] Unusually warm weather was observed on the whole European territory of the USSR in the third 10-day period of January and the beginning of February. The average air temperature everywhere exceeded the average long-term temperature by 5-10 degrees. The snow cover boundary at the end of January and the beginning of February extended along the line Tallin-Smolensk-Sumy-Donetsk-Rostov-na-Donu-Stavropol-Elista-Nalchik. Its depth in rayons adjacent to this territory was from 2 cm to 10 cm , and in northeastern areas, from 55 cm to 75 cm. The soil is thawed in Lithuania, in southwest Belorussia, in Moldavia, and in a large part of the Ukraine and the North Caucasus rayon. In the remaining rayons of the European territory of the country, the depth of soil freezing was from 15 to 65 cm.

Under the influence of the thaw, the winter hardiness of the winter grain crops fell in a majority of the rayons. In Moldavia, in the west and the southwest of the Ukraine and in Krasnodarskiy Kray, where on individual days the air temperature was 10-13 degrees, in the Crimea and Krasnodarskiy Kray—15 to 16 degrees in places—the winter crops began to vegetate. In the rest of the rayons

of the European territory, they were in a state of winter dormancy. There were no heavy frosts anywhere. The minimal temperature for a tillering node depth level for winter crops in a majority of the rayons remained within a range of 2-3 degrees, and in the Middle Povolzhye—minus 6-10 degrees. Their wintering went well. In the south of the Northern rayon, in the northeast of the Central rayon, in the north of the Volga-Vyatsk and in the west of the Ural rayon, where the snow cover is high and the soil freezing is not great (less than 30 cm), the minimal temperature of the soil at a tillering node depth level for winter grain crops remained within a range of 0-2 degrees. The processes of plant rotting here increased somewhat.

In a majority of the agricultural rayons of Western Siberia, the beginning of the third 10-day period of January was cold.

Warmer than usual weather prevailed in Kazakhstan. The average air temperature for the 10-day period exceed the long-term average by 2-6 degrees, and in the north of the republic, by 7-9 degrees. There was a snow cover almost everywhere, and its height was principally 15-25 cm. The wintering of winter crops in the southern oblasts of the republic went well.

It was warmer than usual in Central Asia in the first half of the 10-day period, and it got cooler afterwards. In Kirghiziya, the minimal soil temperature at a tillering node depth level for winter grain crops dropped in places to minus 13 degrees, which was dangerous for poorly developed crops of winter barley.

Late-February Conditions

904B0162A Moscow SELSKAYA ZHIZN in Russian 6 Mar 90 p 3

[Article by Kh. Tebuyev, agrometeorologist: "Weather and Crops"]

[Text] Unusually warm weather prevailed on the European territory of the USSR. The average air temperature for the 10-day period in a large part of the territory was 7-13 degrees higher, and in the North Caucasus, 4-6 degrees higher than the long-term average. There was intensive melting of snow in a majority of the rayons.

In the Baltics and in the south of the Northwest rayon, in Belorussia, in the Ukraine, in Moldavia, and in the North Caucasus, where there is no snow and the soil has thawed to a full depth, the vegetation of winter grain crops has started—30 to 40 days earlier than the average long-term periods.

On the rest of the territory of the Northwest rayon, in the central (except for the northeast oblasts), the Central-Chernozem rayons and in the Lower Volga, as a result of warm weather in the second 10-day period, the snow cover has gone from the fields, but the vegetation of winter grain crops has not started here yet.

In the Northern, Volgo-Vyatsk, Uralsk rayons, and in the north of the Povolzhskiy Rayon, the winter grain crops were in a state of winter dormancy under snow cover, whose depth was from 10-60 cm. On a large part of this territory at the beginning of the 10- day period, the frosts reached 17-27 degrees, and, in places, 28-30 degrees. Afterwards it warmed up. The minimal temperature of the soil to a tillering node depth level for winter grain crops remained within a range of minus 1-5 degrees, and in the south of the Uralskiy Rayon, minus 10 degrees. The conditions for wintering of winter grain crops were satisfactory. To the east of the Northern Rayon, to the north of the Volgo-Vyatsk, and to the west of the Uralskiy rayons, where, in fields with winter crops, a high snow cover, up to 35-60 cm, and a slight soil freezing prevailed, there was a continuation in winter grain crops of an intensive expenditure of nutritional substances on respiration and in the process of plant asphyxiation.

In a majority of the agricultural rayons of Siberia at the beginning of the 10-day period, the minimal air temperature was from minus 25 to minus 35 degrees, and in the northeast of Irkutsk Oblast and in the Transbaykal—from minus 36 to minus 41 degrees. Afterwards, it warmed up. The maximum air temperature was 1-5 degrees, and in the eastern half of Irkutsk Oblast and the Transbaykal—from minus 1 to minus 10 degrees. On the average in the 10-day period, the air temperature was higher than the long-term average by 3-8 degrees, and in the east of Irkutsk Oblast and in the Transbaykal, it was close to it, and in some places 2-3 degrees lower. The winter grain crops were in a state of winter dormancy under snow cover, whose depth was principally 15-35 cm, and in the north of the territory, more than 50 cm. Therefore, the minimum soil temperature at a winter grain crop tillering node depth here was in the range of 5-10 degrees. The wintering of the winter grain crops went well. Only in individual rayons of Novosibirsk and Kemerovo Oblasts and Altayskiy Kray, because of an irregular laying of the snow cover, the minimum soil temperature to a tillering node depth level dropped to minus 18-20 degrees, which was dangerous for the crops.

In Kazakhstan in the 10-day period, the average air temperature exceeded the average long-term temperature by 3-9 degrees, and only in the southeast of the republic was it close to it. In the south of Kazakhstan, the winter grain crops were basically in a state of winter dormancy, and in places under snow cover.

The weather was changeable in the republics of Central Asia. On individual days, at the beginning and in the middle of the 10-day period, the minimal air temperature was from minus 1 to minus 5 degrees, and in the north of the region, and also in Kirghizia and the eastern half of Tajikistan—from minus 6 to minus 15 degrees. It was warm for most of the 10-day period. Winter grain crops were growing in a large part of the territory, except for Kirghizia.

Scientific

Cosmos-2061 Launched Into Orbit

LD2003085590 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0836 GMT 20 Mar 90

[Text] Moscow, 20 March (TASS)—It is officially reported here that another artificial Earth satellite, Cosmos-2061, intended for the continution of space research, was launched today from the Soviet Union by a Cosmos launch vehicle. It has been put into an orbit with the parameters: initial period of revolution: 105.1 minutes; apogee: 1031 km; perigee: 994 km; inclination of orbit: 82.9 degrees. The apparatus is functioning normally.

Military

Reforms Urged To Cure Army's Poor Morale

AU2003113090 Paris AFP in English 1119 GMT 20 Mar 90

[Text] Moscow, March 20 (AFP)—A group of Soviet army officers in the Congress of People's Deputies says the Red Army is in need of radical transformation to cope with "social tensions" arising from troop repatriations and the changing political landscape, it was reported Tuesday.

INTERFAX, the news bulletin published by Radio Moscow, said 22 army officers holding seats in parliament, had called for changes to remedy the "deep crisis" affecting the army.

The 22 said the government's decision to repatriate an estimated 100,000 Soviet army families from other Warsaw Pact countries had accentuated the malaise and social friction within the army.

The group called for a complete rethink of the relationship between the army and political power and for the defence portfolio to be handed over to a civilian.

Col Gen Interviewed on Principles of Armed Forces

LD1603072690 Moscow TASS in English 1806 GMT 15 Mar 90

[Text] Moscow March 15 TASS—"The seeming advantages of a territorial principle when forming the army, as compared with an ex-territorial principle, prompt numerous proposals for using the former principle," said Colonel General Grigoriy Krivosheyev, deputy chief of the General Staff of the Soviet Armed Forces in an interview with TASS. The springtime call-up to the Soviet Armed Forces, is drawing nearer.

The general said that many such proposals are being made by citizens and informal organizations in the Baltic and Transcaucasian Union republics.

Krivosheyev said that various ways of building up the army and the navy are suggested.

The general believes that the most serious of them involves the transition from an ex-territorial to a territorial principle of building up the active Armed Forces.

When this principle is applied, the transportation of troops is sharply reduced and draftees remain among their own people and in a familiar climate. Their relatives and friends can visit them.

The general said that a more profound analysis of the territorial principle enables one to see a number of substantial drawbacks. First of all, the building up of the army according to this principle will not sufficiently replenish the army's and navy's personnel.

Krivosheyev believes that the territorial principle of forming the army runs counter to fundamental views on the protection of the state as a nation-wide task.

The main principles of the composition of the Armed Forces in the Soviet federation are justifiable. The state's task of ensuring the country's defences cannot be solved in the framework of regional or republican isolation.

And, finally, allowing draftees to remain on their home territory will not help develop and deepen ethnic relations. It would not help form internationalism among young people of various nationalities. It would deprive them of the opportunity to see the country and get enriched with the culture of a different ethnic group, of widening their world outlook.

Such service is not in keeping with the principle of social justice and the equality of citizens before law. "A great number of Soviet people demand in their letters that a single principle for the building up of the army and the navy be observed," Krivosheyev said.

Accusations Against Internal Forces Rejected

PM1903103990 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 17 Mar 90 First Edition p 2

[Interview with Colonel General Yu. Shatalin, chief of the USSR Ministry of Internal Affairs Internal Security Forces, by Lieutenant Colonel A. Semenyaka: "As Serviceman and Citizen. Colonel General Yu. Shatalin; date and place of interview not given: '...That Requires the Stabilization of the Situation in the Country'"—first paragraph is KRASNAYA ZVEZDA introduction]

[Text] Colonel General Yu. Shatalin, chief of the USSR Ministry of Internal Affairs Internal Security Forces, is a candidate RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] people's deputy for Moscow's No. 17 Kalininskiy Territorial Okrug.

[Semenyaka] Yuriy Vasilyevich, how do you rate your chances of being elected to the Russian parliament?

[Shatalin] Frankly speaking, I have not "added them up." There simply has not been time.

However, if voters place their confidence in me, I will seek above all as far as possible to step up the struggle against lawbreakers.

[Semenyaka] Let's hope that the voters are aware of the special nature of your service and take it into account, as it were. I know that last year alone you spent 212 days with the troops. The number of duty tours has not decreased this year either. And this, naturally, could not fail to affect your participation in the election campaign.

[Shatalin] Quite so. Frankly speaking, however, this is not what worries me now. Take for instance my last trip to Azerbaijan. What made it necessary? Letters and cables began arriving at various government organs in which people reported that our servicemen were in every way aiding and abetting the evacuation of Armenians from the Azad and Kamo settlements. I personally had to deal with 15 to 20 cables of this content every day. What was worrying was that reports of this kind signed by representatives of the local authorities were also received. Therefore, on the instructions of the minister of internal affairs, I left to investigate this phenomenon on the spot.

And a meeting with representatives of Azerbaijan and Armenia took place. We came to agreement with difficulty, step by step. We agreed, in particular, that the purchase and sale of houses in those villages should proceed solely on a voluntary basis, with no pressure whatsoever on the local inhabitants from the internal security forces, who are performing the exclusive task of maintaining public order in the region.

[Semenyaka] So why then in this situation has a shadow nevertheless fallen upon the troops?

[Shatalin] I am convinced that the situation in the region is being fueled by people who benefit from chaos, confusion, and a state of nervousness. They are not at all concerned by how people live or by what they have been going through these last 2 years. These elements are trying to achieve their ends by spreading rumors that bring military servicemen into disrepute and by committing various acts of provocation. Yet ordinary soldiers, warrant officers, and officers do have a limit to their physical strength and morale. They will, of course, be in the region as long as necessary. But at what cost? It is okay for the regular officers, but as far as the 18- to 20-year-old guys are concerned, the strain on them is very difficult to bear.

[Semenyaka] So do you see the solution to the situation in a change in the principle of troop recruitment?

[Shatalin] Yes, I do favor professional troops. Many problems will be removed with their creation. We have petitioned for 2 years to carry out an an experiment to bring 5 military units up to strength with professionals in categories of service such as operational units, special motorized militia units, units guarding correctional-labor establishments and carrying out judicial and routine escort duty, and units protecting important state facilities.

[Semenyaka] Professional troops are a matter of the future. But how, as things stand today, so to speak, are you tackling the tasks?

[Shatalin] Unfortunately, some people are spreading rumors that the internal security forces, particularly the operational units, are manned by the products of children's homes and broken homes, that robot-like people who have nothing to lose serve in them. That is an utter lie. The people who serve are normal people, the majority of whom are honest, brave, and devoted to their work. The people can see this. In Fergana Oblast and in Armenia and Azerbaijan, wherever troops have been brought in to maintain public order, the local population has repeatedly requested that they not be pulled out after the situation is stabilized.

But in general, to be absolutely frank, I have the most fervent desire that our people would have to leave their garrisons and places of permament stationing as infrequently as possible, in order that they can live like everyone else—go to the movies and the library and be with their families. But that requires the stabilization of the situation in the country. And to that end we will spare no effort and will surmount every hardship and trial.

Arkhipov Discusses Performance of Military Farms

LD1503111490 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0956 GMT 13 Mar 90

[Text] Moscow, 13 Mar (TASS)—"Military state farms and the subsidiary holdings of military units are making a big contribution toward increasing agricultural output in the country," Army General Vladimir Arkhipov, deputy minister of defense, chief of the Rear Services of the USSR Armed Forces. He gave an interview today to a TASS correspondent before the all-service conference of workers on military state farms and subsidiary holdings of military units, which begins tomorrow on matters relating to fulfilment of the food program in the Army and fleet.

Gen. Arkhipov recalled that, in order to improve servicemen's food, in the sixties and seventies dozens of military state farms were set up (two or three in each military district and in the fleet), as well as subsidiary holdings in each unit, in the system of the Rear Services of the USSR Armed Forces. Depending upon natural and climatic conditions, the military state farms, according to Gen. Arkhipov, specialize in production of livestock or poultry, potatoes or vegetables. "All the produce obtained in the military state farms goes to supply the personnel of units and sub-units of the districts and fleets," the general stressed. He added that this thereby alleviates the strained situation in regard to shortages of food produce in the country. These farms were as a rule

set up, with the help of military engineering equipment, on low-grade land unsuitable for cultivation. "Nevertheless, the majority of these are today highly profitable farms," the general asserts.

Naval Accidents Blamed on Unreliable Hardware

PM1603111190 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 15 Mar 90 First Edition p 2

[Article by Captain First Class S. Bystrov, editor of the KRASNAYA ZVEZDA Naval Department, in response to readers' letter: "Loss of Nuclear-Powered Vessels. The 'Undercurrents' It Revealed"—first seven paragraphs are readers' letter]

[Excerpts] Esteemed editorial office! We have been forced to turn to your military newspaper since we have discovered to our confusion and dismay that during the glasnost era, glasnost is by no means available to everyone. We found that out for ourselves when we sent a letter to KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA—a newspaper which, having decided to defend the interests of submariners in connection with the loss of the Komsomolets nuclear submarine, is actually confusing readers and striving to pin the blame for everything that happened to our vessel on the crew, the dead commander, and the Navy.

Almost all KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA articles on this subject display not merely a lack of competence, not merely a lack of any attempt to thoroughly probe the matter, but also blatant factual errors, totally unjustified conjecture, and references to former and serving naval officers who have only a vague idea about the accident.

It is hard to grasp the fact that we surviving submariners have been forced to defend ourselves and our dead comrades who honestly did their duty. Against whom? Against journalists trying to depict the tragedy in the light of their own personal attitude, not only to the case in question but to the country's Armed Forces as a whole.

So we tried to defend ourselves in a letter to KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA following the publication of the discussion between its correspondent V. Yunisov and A. Gorbachev headlined "Eight Months Later" (17 December 1989). The letter was published 8 February this year in a brief and emasculated form, and alongside it—on the rest of the page—the newspaper published yet another "viewpoint" (this time the view of A. Yemelyanenkov, deputy chief editor of the weekly SOBESEDNIK) that literally overwhelmed the reader with its breadth of further assumptions, conjectures, and opinions.

We are increasingly coming to the conclusion that KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA is trying to exert deliberate pressure on public opinion without waiting for the conclusions of the State Commission, or rather, anticipating them.

Written at the request of surviving crew members from the Komsomolets submarine.
[Signed] Captain First Class B. Kolyada; Captains Third Class S. Dvorov and A. Verezgov; Captain Lieutenant I. Orlov; Senior Lieutenant A. Zaytsev [passage omitted]

Not everyone was initially able to obtain exhaustive data on what had happened.

Ultimately very many questions were cleared up. But the questions about the specific circumstances which led to the loss of the nuclear vessel and about the current level of accidents in the Navy in general have been and continue to be acute. The State Commission investigating the Komsomolets accident has to dot all the "i's." Nobody can imagine a fuller, more objective, or more detailed investigation at the present time.

The State Commission session reporting the interim results of its sections work, to which journalists were invited, proposed that people refrain from publishing articles in the press until the final results are out. This would probably have been conducive to the appearance of more detailed and objective articles. But KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA considered it necessary once again to state its own view—which ultimately boils down to claiming that an inadequately trained crew and the Navy were to blame for the tragedy. [passage omitted]

However, justice demands that we lift the veil slightly on another aspect too—the design and technical shortcomings of the materiel which preordained the accident and the course of its further development.

It is a longstanding rather than recent phenomenon that the Navy receives vessels which are not in line with our established image of sophisticated, reliable, high-quality combat equipment.

Here I think it would be apposite to quote Academician A.P. Aleksandrov, who once discussed with me the development of our first nuclear submarine, subsequently named the Leninskiy Komsomol: "We agreed that we would not simply hand over the boat to the Navy, but that the Navy would operate it on a trial basis. It was a terrible problem finding a formula whereby the Navy would agree to take the first boat." Fleet Admiral V.N. Chernavin, commander in chief of the Navy, who took part in this discussion, noted: "Anatoliy Petrovich, you obviously started something with that 'trial basis' phrase. It's still used today for handing over vessels. That's how the worst vessels are handed over. When the shipbuilders are having trouble with the plan, everyone falls back on that term."

Here are a few examples from 1985-89:

One nuclear submarine spent more than half of its warranty period being repaired and modified. It was the subject of a complaint, and the Navy's suit against the USSR Ministry of the Shipbuilding Industry was upheld by the State Board of Arbitration. It was not the only vessel to suffer this fate.

With a view to preventing accidents caused by the failure of individual elements of submarines' electrical equipment to meet technical conditions, the operation of two vessels was entirely prohibited in 1989.

During this period Ministry of the Shipbuilding Industry enterprises were the subject of 529 complaints incurring compulsory fines amounting to more than 3 million rubles [R] for delivering substandard equipment for nuclear submarines.

Each defect which emerges on a vessel is an accident in the making. Our poorly trained seamen, as KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA tries to claim, are then placed in an irregular situation—that is, a situation not covered by operating instructions.

Thus a defect in the main turbine system on one submarine under warranty led to an unsanctioned buildup of engine speed, which resulted in the boat running aground.

Incidentally, the Navy did not inform the press about this, just as it failed to inform the press about another incident which happened to another boat during docking. This vessel, incidentally, had been returning to base from a plant where further work had just been done on the main turbine control system. Thanks to the commander's skill the vessel escaped with slight damage, which was covered by a fine of around R900,000. The Navy does not notify the press about its accidents for two reasons. Because such phenomena have long been considered everyday occurrences and because for some reason sailors are not accustomed to complaining loudly about industry, despite the constant existence of acute contradictions.

Now, since it is the Komsomolets which is the subject of the dispute, it is reasonable to quote certain views of submarine commanders who have an idea about that vessel's technical reliability.

The bulkheads on the Komsomolets did not provide a watertight seal between the three end compartments with regard to the oil system and the bulkhead gland of the main shaft line while the vessel was under way. But even when the shaft line between the two end compartments was shut down it was impossible to ensure a watertight seal when the pressure in the compartments exceeded 1.4 kilograms per square centimeter. The pressure in number seven compartment, which was on fire, was around 10 times higher.

The main ballast tanks on the Komsomolets had no kingston valves, which in itself reduces a boat's reserve buoyancy in a rough sea or if trim differences emerge during an emergency.

The firefighting system on this vessel was not centrally controlled, which was a retrograde step in the planning of submarine firefighting systems. And in any case freon as a firefighting agent is not effective in major fires, since it itself ignites at temperatures above 580 degrees celsius. Instead of red copper [krasnomednyy] seals, polyamide seals were used in the boat's air systems. In even localized fires these lead to depressurization of the high-pressure air valves [armatura].

The lack of an information system and the unreliability of shipboard communications systems prevented the main command post from having accurate information on the actual condition of the compartments in order to make the necessary decisions.

Certain electrical networks were unprotected against short-circuiting, which led to fires in other compartments and a loss of control over general ship systems, and considerably complicated the fight to save the vessel.

Instead of saving submariners' lives in the gas-contaminated compartment, the system killed those people who used it as specifically intended.

The list of shortcomings could be continued. And yet, strictly speaking, all of them are nothing but factors of increased risk. And when the accident happened they promoted the creation of those extremely rare situations for which the personnel have not trained and should not train. People can only be trained for things that can be predicted. [passage omitted]

Unfortunately, it will not be possible to establish why fire broke out on the Komsomolets. (The commission has determined the most likely reason—an electrical short-circuit in compartment seven.) The only person who saw the fire start—Senior Seaman N. Bukhnikashvili, who was on duty in compartment seven—was obviously not able to report anything since he died instantly.

Yes, there are plenty of reasons behind the loss of the Komsomolets. But the prime reason is fire. All the other reasons are secondary.

Why do fires happen on board submarines? For example, analysis of the 16 fires on nuclear submarines in recent years shows that they were linked with short-circuits in the main distribution boards. And the cause is production and technological defects in the automatic circuit breakers (due to the poor quality of their assembly). In practice there are also many other technical reasons. Having twice taken part in the navigation of nuclear submarines under the ice of the Arctic, I had occasion to observe such a fire during my second trip.

Why do small fires turn into serious fires? In violation of the requirements of the relevant documentation flammable materials are used in the construction of nuclear submarines. Existing fire-fighting systems are not effective enough. There are no effective systems to extinguish fires on electrical equipment that is under load. During a fire is it virtually impossible to switch off the power supply to boards and panels. There is no system to provide early warning and accident notification and to stop the fire from spreading...

Is the Navy or industry to be blamed for this? The answer is yes and no. Funds are needed to create the appropriate safety systems. Considerable funds. Even the much richer Americans do not have them.

An analysis of the accidents which occurred in the U.S. Navy in 1985-89 carried out by U.S. military experts shows that the main causes were flaws in the design, production, and installation of equipment. During the said period 37 accidents occurred on submarines caused by fires, failure of power and other equipment, and for other reasons.

The Navy Pays Three Times Over

What for? For the hardware and equipment supplied to it. What is more, triple payment is the minimum. It begins by paying for the ship, for example. Next it pays for its technical servicing and repair. And then it pays for eliminating design and manufacturing defects.

The boiler pipes on the cruiser Baku began breaking down even during the state sea trials. When the ship was accepted by the Navy the pipes had to be replaced. For several months the cruiser commander and the Navy have been involved in a lawsuit with the plant director. And all this while the ship is still under warranty.

The Kirov, our first nuclear-powered missile cruiser, suffered a great deal in this respect. After 10 years of use its main reduction gear broke down—this is a mechanism which usually outlasts the ship. And since it is a hermetically sealed unit its premature failure cannot be blamed on the service personnel.

No provision is made for the repair of the main reduction gear, therefore there is no provision for removing the unit from the ship.

The cruiser went into dock. The ship's bottom was removed, the reduction gear unit extracted, loaded onto a train, and transported to the plant where it was repaired, brought back, the ship returned to the dock, the bottom was removed again (it had been welded on), and the reduction gear fitted... Money is one thing, but because of this unscheduled use of the dock a whole combined unit of submarines could not undergo a planned overhaul.

When KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA printed rumors about political unrest among the crew of the Kirov, the crew became worried about the preparation for a long-distance voyage. The number one duct in port side atomic steam generating unit, which is supposed to last years, sprang a leak. More costly work. It was carried out. The cruiser left for the Mediterranean only... to return to base having completed only one-third of its voyage. The starboard atomic steam generating unit's number one duct had sprung a leak. All the problems boil down to a single cause—the poor quality of the equipment.

What has this cost the Navy and the state? More money than we have. And if only the Kirov were a rare exception.

There are more than enough facts and examples here. The Navy reports them to the authorities. Decisions are made to finish work off and improve quality and reliability but no one knows how decisions are being fulfilled nowadays, all the more so since they are not backed up by economic measures. [passage omitted]

The situation regarding the commissioning of ships in the future simply has to change, I think. Our foreign policy has changed. It has not just changed, it has become realistic. And it requires a realistic view both of the Armed Forces as a whole and of the Navy.

It seems staggering now, but unfinished vessels have been accepted by the Navy with the knowledge and approval of the highest authorities. Strange as it may seem, this had an expediency of its own. The characteristics of shipbuilding cannot be disregarded here, either.

It takes up to 10 years to plan and build the prototype of a new design of ship. And designers, with the consent of the Navy leadership, try to fit ships not only with the very latest equipment, weaponry, and technical resources available... but also with things which at the time exist as nothing more than designs or concepts. Otherwise a ship may become obsolete before it is actually built. Of course, the element of risk here is great. And, unfortunately, the situation in which a ship is built but for some reason is behind the times is not rare.

What is to be done? Suppose a ship is not accepted. In that case it will have to remain at the shipyard for an unspecified length of time. Equipment is not being used, the crew is not training. Everything slowly crumbles and falls apart. Is that good?

The alternative: The ship is accepted and the industry makes the appropriate commitments to bring it up to standard by a specified date. In that event the ship joins a fleet, puts to sea, the crew works out combat training assignments and maintains a certain level of combat capability...

The choice of option was dependent on many concrete factors and the decision was made by the country's highest authorities. And in the process they considered not only the interests of really increasing the Navy's combat readiness but also political prestige and the attainment of strategic parity...

It goes without saying that it would be far better if the shipbuilding program were implemented perfectly right from the start. The Navy cannot and does not wish to accept it in any other form—otherwise it would fail in its purpose. But political objectives can be satisfied to a certain extent by rough work improved upon at a later date. That is how we have found ourselves with a whole series of ships nicknamed "doves of peace" in the Navy. Because they are accepted with "non-firing guns."

The Navy loses most from these compromises, paying for this both with its combat ability and materially, transferring to the industry—in the form of payment and repayment—the lion's share of the resources allocated to it from the state budget and being forced to make economies on everything else as well.

If it changes the mechanism whereby resources allocated for defense are spent, perestroyka of the military-industrial complex (without which perestroyka of the Army and Navy is impossible) could help to effectively resolve a large complex of problems which at present do not lend themselves to resolution. Quality must be paramount in the industry's economic interests. The enormous energy, persistence, and inventiveness in "legalizing" shoddy output that is sometimes demonstrated by industrial workers promises general benefit if it is channeled into a striving for quality.

Of course, it would be wrong to see extremes in the same enterprises of the Ministry of the Shipbuilding Industry. Their complex work includes a vast amount of ordinary labor by countless numbers of other enterprises, including some from other ministries. If someone supplies even one unreliable component, it leads to a loss of quality in the entire, highly complex "end product," such as a ship, for example. That is a fundamental point. Everyone understands this. But why do the measures taken to improve quality—usually reflected in the creation of instructions or binding documents—fail to produce the desired result? Because there are mechanisms which "absolve" the executors of their responsibility or diminish that responsibility.

It is a matter primarily of the guarantee period. If, for example, a ship is built to last for 25 years, where is the common sense in having a guarantee that only covers the next two and a half years? There must be real responsibility rather than symbolic responsibility, whereby unreliability becomes disadvantageous to those guilty of this. At present, however, the Navy is the only one to be disadvantaged by unreliability. No more resources will be allocated to it, so all it can do is tighten its belt to cover the unforeseen expenditure.

The monopoly is also only to the advantage of the enterprises. The Navy is deprived of choice and so is forced to accept whatever it is given.

The loss of the Komsomolets laid bare the contradiction between the Navy and industry. It laid it bare for the whole nation to see. That being the case, the question of culpability has extended beyond interdepartmental relations and disputes. Public opinion is demanding a clear answer.

The mass media's revelations about the accident rate in the Navy sound very impressive. In this respect, the Navy is incriminated if only because it has concealed its accidents in the past. But, strange though it may seem, it had less of a vested interest in this than industry. From my own 22 years' experience of working in the military press, I know that it was possible to "leak" information about an accident blamed on the personnel as a last resort. But under no circumstances did the same go for an accident through the fault of industry. Because there existed a guideline which said: Our equipment is the best, the most reliable, and cannot break down. How well the industry lived behind this screen of silence! The loss of the Komsomolets made a breach in this screen.

Do Sailors Possess Great Skill?

[Passage omitted] Yes, the professional training of naval sailors requires resolute improvement. Yes, the Navy also has reserves here, which are far from always utilized efficiently. But, still, to recklessly accuse sailors of a lack of skill without considering that resources, money, and time are needed for this, is tantamount to engaging in idle logomachy instead of constructive discussions. It is a reflex of the administrative-edict thinking, when "give, give" replaces calculations, forecasts, and economic support.

(Incidentally, the surviving members of the Komsomolets crew were captiously interrogated by the State Commission, which also included representatives of design bureaus and industry. All unanimously noted the high standard of the submariners' specialized knowledge.) [passage omitted]

At the end of last year U.S. Navy specialists drew up proposals whose realization will, in their opinion, help to reduce the accident rate. The main proposals include raising the theoretical standard of personnel training, improving servicemen's practical skills in handling combat hardware, introducing computer-based simulators into the training process, and beefing up the Navy's control over the building and repair of warships.

The order of enumeration merits attention: Problems of enhancing personnel training occupy the first three positions. And this in the professional U.S. fleet. Our drafted sailors have not let as many accidents happen as the U.S. professionals.

What the Americans put in last place in terms of influence on the accident rate—the reliability of hardware—we put in first place.

However, recognition of our industry's services is incontestable. This is despite the fact that it, like our entire economy and country, is experiencing serious difficulties. The question now is not one of shifting the blame onto someone but of objectively analyzing everything and taking effective, economically supported and conditioned measures. This means, above all, **enhancing the design perfection, technical reliability, and quality of our ships and the efficiency of anti-accident and rescue means and enhancing the quality of personnel training.** When put into practice, each of these phrases will mean tremendous, long-overdue changes. It is probably time to discuss them at parliamentary level too. For so far all good intentions at various levels have vanished into the sand. Because they have not received proper economic and financial support.

Yes, many millions of rubles are needed to resolve the urgent problems of enhancing the fleet's quality and reliability.

The question is—where to find them? It is a very acute question today. Of course, the simplest way would be to take them from the funds allocated to the Navy. But, given the existing "nonequivalent" economic relationship with industry, this would mean new restrictions in things that the fleet constantly lacks: in comprehensive support for warships' activities, in the improvement of base facilities, and in social questions. So the simplest solution can hardly be called a qualitative solution. You always have to pay and pay again for substandard solutions. And the fleet will pay again. As always, in money, disorder, and lives.

The Komsomolets tragedy cannot be the object of an interdepartmental skirmish in which the interests of the Navy and of naval sailors take a back seat, for all the seeming obsession with their destinies. In my view, this must be understood by journalists above all. Unless, of course, tendentiousness prevents this. Thus, KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA's desire to help the Navy could only be welcomed. But, of the many recent articles in the All-Union Lenin Communist Youth League's central organ on the subject of the Navy, just one was amicable in the full sense of the word: "The Nautilus Continues Its Voyage..." of 18 January this year, devoted to the U.S. Navy's first nuclear-powered submarine. All the rest devoted to the Navy fit within the not unsuccessful policy of certain mass media of discrediting the Armed Forces.

Mi-26 Helicopter Performance, Problems Reported

LD0903211690

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 1800 GMT on 9 March in its "Vremya" newscast carries a three-minute report on the use of the Mi-26 helicopter developed by the Mil Design Bureau headed by designer Marat Nikolayevich Tishchenko. The Mi-26 is said to be the most powerful cargo helicopter in the world and is capable of working in the most difficult conditions. A video report from Nizhnevartovsk follows showing a tractor being loaded into a Mi-26 helicopter. The helicopter is said to be capable of carrying up to 20 tonnes of cargo either onboard or suspended outside. The vehicle is mostly used for carrying equipment for geologists. A helicopter pilot is interviewed, he praises the performance of the helicopter. According to the data provided by the Ministry of Civil Aviation, however, about 30 percent of the Mi-26s in use stand idle because of defects. An official from the Civil Aviation Directorate complains about the shortage of repair facilities for the helicopters. The standard life of the helicopter's engines is expected to be 800 hours but, in fact, it is only half that figure because of production faults, the official says.

Baltic Republics

Vilnius Radio Carries 20 Mar Supreme Council

Coat of Arms Discussed

LD2003095390

[Editorial Report] Vilnius Domestic Service in Lithuanian at 0800 GMT on 20 March begins a live relay from the Lithuanian Supreme Council session in Vilnius.

The session opens with Deputy Kazimieras Motieka in the chair. He asks the deputies to register. Today's agenda includes election of chairmen of the permanent commissions, the transport procuracy and militia, a subcommittee for the affairs of eastern Lithuania, and the republic's coat of arms. A proposal is made to include in the agenda the marking of the republic's borders.

At 0811 GMT a deputy states that there has been a telephone call from Leningrad from the U.S. Consul who asked about the situation in Lithuania. He was told that everything is quiet. A similar telephone call was also received from Australia.

At 0815 GMT various procedural problems are discussed.

At 0822 GMT election of the chairman of the Commission for Education, Science, and Culture is debated. It is not clear who is elected to the post of chairman due to poor reception.

At 0840 GMT the procurator's supervision of transport is debated. A resolution that the procurator's supervision of transport in the republic should be carried out by the republican procurator is voted upon and adopted.

At 0852 GMT Landsbergis supports establishing such a commission on a provisional basis, with its work to later be assumed by other existing permanent commissions.

At 0854 GMT the deputies vote on and approve the setting up of a provisional commission for the affairs of eastern Lithuania. Deputy Povilionis will coordinate the work of this commission.

At 0855 GMT Deputy Ilgunas reports on two versions of the republic's coat of arms. Historian Rimsa speaks on behalf of the heraldry commission. Television cameras are instructed to show the coat of arms to viewers. Rimsa continues his report.

At 0915 GMT the design of the state emblem is debated. Numerous opinions are voiced concerning its colors and design, which dates back to the 15th century. The session is adjourned until 1100 GMT.

Marking of Borders Debated

LD2003132490

[Editorial Report] Vilnius Domestic Service in Lithuanian at 1000 GMT on 20 March resumes its live relay from the Lithuanian Supreme Council session in Vilnius.

Debates on the state emblem continue. A vote is taken on whether to continue with the state emblem as drawn by Zikaras and used in the prewar republic of Lithuania or the alternative emblem drawn by Kazdailis. By a majority of votes the standard state emblem of the prewar Republic of Lithuania is adopted.

At 1019 GMT Vytautas Landsbergis reports on the political situation. He reads telegrams of support and analyzes Moscow's statements. His report ends at 1057 GMT.

At 1059 GMT L. Sabutis reports on the state seal and its use.

At 1100 GMT Deputy Butkevicius reports on marking the borderline. He says the exact borderline which previously existed should be restored and marked and that the Supreme Council of Lithuania should now entrust the Council of Ministers of the Republic to begin the work of marking the state borders of the Republic. At present posts of economic control will be set up on the Lithuanian border.

At 1105 GMT V. Landsbergis says the marking of the border should be clearly explained so that people who have relatives in the USSR will not become alarmed.

At 1107 GMT debates on border marking begin. Deputy Butkevicius says this does not mean closing the borders between the USSR and Lithuania. He says the select committee working on the issue is of the opinion that only the borderline with Belorussia will cause any difficulty. Some deputies express concern about the safety of signposts because they could be destroyed as soon as they are erected.

At 1114 GMT B. Rupeika asks if the present borders will be the borders of the Republic of Lithuania and if the Supreme Council thinks that while marking the borderline contacts with Soviet border troops are possible. A question is raised whether the borderline is possible before negotiations with the USSR state. Landsbergis says there can be no negotiations concerning the borders, the problem has been solved and settled. Many deputies urge that the work of marking and establishing the borderline of the republic should begin. It is decided that the Supreme Council of the Republic of Lithuania will entrust the Council of Ministers to start preliminary work on establishing the exact borderlines of the Republic with 100 deputies voting in favor.

At 1130 GMT a report on the draft select commissions is heard being delivered. It is proposed that these commissions be confirmed at today's session.

At 1140 GMT the composition of the commission is being debated.

At 1145 GMT the plenary session is adjourned until 21 Mar at 0800 GMT.

Landsbergis Responds to Moscow Statements

LD2003112390 Vilnius in Lithuanian to North America 0100 GMT 20 Mar 90

[Text] A statement by the Soviet Government on the situation in Lithuania was published this evening. A TASS report also assesses a reply by the chairman of the Supreme Council of the Republic of Lithuania to the Soviet president, Mikhail Gorbachev, signed yesterday.

Vilnius radio has asked the chairman of the Supreme Council, Vytautas Landsbergis, to express his opinion about the above mentioned statements.

[Begin Landsbergis recording] A statement quotes our reply to President Gorbachev and briefly comments on it. In the opinion of TASS, the demands by the Third Congress of Deputies are essentially ignored. I would not like to comment on it; our positions are different. We do not expect that tomorrow the Soviet Union will accept Lithuania's position, and they should not expect that we will change our position. Further, there are some incorrect facts in the TASS statement. Crude violations of the constitutional order, arbitrary solution of the problems are mentioned. Probably they had in mind the sovereignty. Since the decision of the Third Congress of Deputies proclaims the Soviet Union's sovereignty over Lithuania, that is, the right of the aggresssor to govern his victim, it is natural that the implementation of Lithuania's sovereign rights in adopting independent laws can be called arbitrary. A report also states that the president has instructed the Soviet Government to take some measures. It is not stated what kind of measures. They, it seems, are reflected in the government statement itself.

I can say about this statement that it contains positive elements. It states that the economy in Lithuania must function stably and that normal economic relations with the Soviet Union's republics should be maintained. This was precisely stated in our message to Prime Minister Ryzhkov. This letter was read at the Third Congress of Deputies. It was met with strange noises, and now the Soviet Government states the same thing. This is logical and rational and our positions coincide here. We may read this paragraph as a certain promise not to blockade Lithuania's economy. It must function maintaining the same amount of supply and mutual exchange of production which are envisaged in this year's Soviet Union state plan. We hope that this will be observed.

There are incorrect facts stating that Lithuania is hastily drawing up plans how to hand over state enterprises to private owners. These are rumors similar to [word indistinct] clamors at the meetings. It is a pity that such incorrect formulations happen in signed documents.

The government statement also says that transport and communications must work smoothly. We want the same. The other thing is that they are worn out in the Soviet Union and there have been various accidents in Lithuania. But, as far the services of the Republic of Lithuania are concerned, we want transport to function in the best possible way. The concern of the Soviet Union that transit to Kaliningrad Oblast and the Klaipeda port should not be hampered, this is also our position, which we have also expressed in the past on various occasions. It is not difficult for Lithuania to secure these ties important to the Soviet Union.

A warning that the government bodies in the Republic of Lithuania should not make decisions which, as it is stated in the text, would violate the (?capacity) of the country's financial and credit system is astonishing. Probably the matter concerns here money, too, about one's own currency. This has been stated for not less than a year in the plans of economic reform of Estonia and Lithuania. Moscow has never made stern political warnings about this.

It is emphasized now that enterprises under Union jurisdiction continue to be the property of the Soviet Union. Last May we already introduced an amendment to the Lithuanian Soviet Socialist Republic Constitution which states that not only all land, forests, air, and sea, but also buildings, banks, industrial enterprises, and communications are the property of the Lithuanian Republic. Then Moscow was not angry and did not threaten us because this was a normal paragraph in the Constitution. It seems that at present the same propositions about property concerning everything that is on Lithuania's territory and the intention to introduce Lithuanian currency provokes the opposition of the Soviet Union's Government. It seems that this shows a certain recognition that Lithuania is different now, that its legal status is different. Concern is expressed about something which did not provoke concern previously.

We understand this concern of the Soviet Union and this effect of surprise and unpreparedness, and really, we are not going to step up the processes which must take place gradually, getting used to it gradually and reaching an agreement in the new situation and its realization.

Maybe some people in Lithuania are concerned about certain organs being instructed to cardinally strengthen the protection of the important power industry, above all, nuclear facilities. If some people think that a nuclear power station of such simple construction should be more protected so that it is not dangerous to people, it is difficult to dispute. The greatest danger is the station itself. Nobody threatens it, unless some mad intruder in the station would like to exact revenge on the whole world because to him the world seems to be different than he previously imagined. [end recording]

Rival Vilnius Political Rallies Held

PM2003095190 Moscow RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA in Russian 20 Mar 90 p 4

[Own correspondent R. Motskus report under the rubric "Stop Press!": "On Events in Lithuania"]

[Text] Vilnius—On 17 March the session of the Lithuanian Republic's Supreme Soviet continued its work, which had been suspended for deputies' meetings with their voters. A report was heard from V. Landsbergis, chairman of the Supreme Soviet, on the political situation in Lithuania.

Two rallies involving thousands of people were held in Vilnius over the weekend. One of them voiced full support for state revival, while the other called for committees to be set up to protect Soviet citizens, for autonomous entities to be proclaimed in certain rayons, etc.

During a news conference V. Landsbergis, chairman of the Lithuanian Supreme Soviet, was asked a question about his meeting with the military. He explained that at that meeting he was handed an official protest from the Baltic Military District Command. The district command is protesting the acts of legislation adopted by the Lithuanian Republic's Supreme Soviet, under which all USSR laws relating to compulsory military service are declared invalid and those articles of the Lithuanian Soviet Socialist Republic Criminal Code and the Administrative Offenses Code which relate to military service are also suspended.

On the whole, the situation in the republic is calm. All enterprises and establishments are functioning. The previous day a rumor had gone around Vilnius that bakery workers were going on strike. But this was at once refuted. It has also been reported that for "technical reasons" telephone communications with foreign countries have been temporarily suspended, although calls to other republics are fully available. Lithuanian television has shown a brief reportage on the first "self-defense" fighters...

More on Rallies

PM1903233790 Moscow SELSKAYA ZHIZN in Russian 20 Mar 90 p 3

[Report by own correspondent N. Lashkevich under the "News from the Republics" rubric: "Protest Rallies"]

[Text] Vilnius—Two rallies, involving tens of thousands of the city's inhabitants, were held in the Lithuanian capital over the weekend.

The first rally, held near the Lithuanian Republic Supreme Soviet building on Saturday, supported the decisions "on restoring an independent Lithuanian state" taken by it.

The second, organized by the Lithuanian Communist Party (on the CPSU platform), Yedinstvo [Unity], and other public and political organizations, sharply protested the decisions made by Lithuanian parliamentary deputies. The placards read "Lithuania wants to live in the USSR!", "We don't want to be the hired hands of new masters!", and so forth and the speeches expressed the basic idea that the republic should remain within the USSR and that it is essential to repeal the adopted acts of legislation aimed at, in the opinion of speakers, restoring the bourgeois system in Lithuania and impairing citizens' rights and freedoms. The rally, in particular, issued calls for acts of civil disobedience to be carried out, adopted decisions on setting up a committee for the salvation and protection of citizens of the USSR and creating a workers' voluntary militia to protect union property, and adopted an appeal to the president of the USSR and a number of other resolutions and appeals.

Thus tension both between different political forces and directly among the population is mounting in Lithuania. And military servicemen are also getting embroiled in conflicts, that has been assisted in no small way by the republic Supreme Soviet decision ending the activity of USSR Defense Ministry Military Commissariats as institutions allegedly alien to the state and deeming USSR laws on compulsory military service invalid on Lithuanian territory. The Baltic Military District command has delivered an official protest against the adopted acts of legislation.

Speaking on republic television on Sunday, V. Landsbergis, chairman of the Lithuanian Supreme Soviet, accused the military of escalating tension in recent days, stating that military aircraft had deliberately increased their flights over the republic Supreme Soviet building. He impugned the explanation furnished by the military command that these were routine maneuvers. Instances were cited of helicopters dropping leaflets over the city urging people to attend the Sunday rally, and this was regarded as interference in the political life of Lithuania. The republic Internal Affairs Ministry had instituted criminal proceedings against the officer of a military unit stationed in Shyaulyay, who, it is claimed, left his military unit while intoxicated, stole a citizen's car, and was seriously wounded offering armed resistance when arrested by the militia.

As we can see, the events in Lithuania are developing with a far from cloudless political sky on the horizon. Regrettably, it must be stated that storm clouds are gathering and that clusters of these are forming basically along ethnic lines.

This was graphically demonstrated by the two rallies. Such political instability gives rise to numerous rumors. People rush to the stores to buy salt and matches or to the savings bank to take out their savings... Workers worry about whether their enterprises are going to pay their wages. Citizens worry about whether the bakers are going to go on strike.

It is only natural that the Russian-speaking population should experience some discomfort in such a nervous

situation, and I am not sure that many of them welcome, for example, the creation of the workers' militia (and might it be paramilitary?) called for on Sunday. You do not have to be a political oracle to see how ruinous the consequences of such extreme countermeasures could be. Confrontation of any kind is extremely dangerous. And today it, alas, continues to gather momentum. And it is difficult to imagine how serious the results of such interethnic confrontation would be. Any ill-considered step by one side or the other could kindle the spark (and quite a few have already been struck today) that will instantly fan the fire of civil conflict. And people here who have assembled at a rally and reflected diverse positions will suddenly find themselves against one another, confronting one another head on.

We have all learned how to protest very successfully during the years of perestroyka. But do we know how to find a sensible, compromise solution? The deputies of the Lithuanian parliament propose starting "talks with the USSR," which is already, in their opinion, a "foreign state." But why not start this dialogue with oneself and invite all sides currently in conflict in the republic to sit down at a round table to clear up the contentious issues—political, military, social, legal, and etc.—and try to find a mutually acceptable option? However, the deputies have so far been otherwise engaged: They are hurriedly forming a government....

Vilnius Radio Carries 19 Mar Supreme Council

Greetings Conveyed

LD1903101290

[Editorial Report] Vilnius Domestic Service in Lithuanian at 0900 GMT on 19 March begins a live relay from the Lithuanian Supreme Council session being held in Vilnius.

The session opens with Deputy Ceslovas Stankevicius in the chair.

At 0902 GMT, Stankevicius proposes sending a message of greetings to former Lithuanian Foreign Minister Juozas Urbyss, since today is Joseph's nameday.

At 0905 GMT Stankevicius proposes the following agenda for today:

A report on the political situation; amendments to the agenda; the Supreme Council structure; changing the name of the mandate commission.

At 0909 GMT Landsbergis makes a statement on the Lithuanian political situation. His statement ends at 0934 GMT.

At 0935 GMT questions are put to Landsbergis concerning his statement.

At 0937 GMT greetings from Bishop Stepanovicius and other clergymen are read out. Landsbergis states that there are many greetings to the Council from the Polish people.

At 0939 GMT Deputy Stankevicius proposes the agenda for 20, 21, 22, and 23 March. He adds that on 26 March there will be meetings of the commissions, and the Supreme Council will meet again on 27 March.

At 0944 GMT a proposal is submitted that a commission be set up on the problems of eastern Lithuania.

Structure of Council Debated

LD1903180190

[Editorial Report] Vilnius Domestic Service in Lithuanian at 1000 GMT on 19 March continues its live relay from the Lithuanian Supreme Council session in Vilnius.

It is announced that 113 deputies are present at the session. Deputy Rasimavicius presents another issue to be discussed: that a decision must be adopted concerning the procurator's supervision over transport. Rasimavicius also proposes that work service as an alternative to military service should be now set up in the republic. A work committee should be set up to supervise these work groups that could be easily transformed into a committee for the defense of the republic, at a later stage. It is decided that a commission will prepare the question and present it for discussion at the session this week.

At 1011 GMT Deputy Sepetys proposes granting an amnesty to some prisoners. Today's agenda is then read out:

1. concerning the political situation; adopt an appeal;
2. changes in the agenda;
3. concerning the structure and principles of work of the Supreme Council—Deputies Abisalas and Paleckis reporting;
4. concerning the change of the name of the mandate commission; and
5. concerning the election of local councils.

At 1015 GMT the agenda is adopted. This is followed by an appeal to Lithuanian people concerning the status of the Soviet Armed Forces in Lithuania, read by Ceslovas Stankevicius, chairman of the session.

At 1018 GMT the deputies decide to edit some of the text especially concerning the KGB troops. The revised text will be ready after the recess.

At 1020 GMT Deputy Abisalas speaks on the structure of the Supreme Council. He says that this draft structure of the Supreme Council was prepared by a parliamentary working group. The structure of the presidium which is to carry out functions of the president is discussed as well the functions of parliamentary commissions and the secretariat and their plenipotentiary powers. The great

majority of deputies will be employed full-time and will be professional members of parliament.

At 1035 GMT the session is adjourned until 1100 GMT.

At 1100 GMT the live relay resumes. Ceslovas Stankevicius and Aleksandras Abisalas are chairing the session. The debates on the structure of the Supreme Council and the functions of specific departments in the parliament continue.

At 1112 GMT Deputy J. Paleckis reports on the main principles affecting the working conditions of a deputy and in particular about a professional parliament. A proposal is put forward that some deputies might like to retain their professions and posts until 1 July; after this date these deputies would be able to see if they can cope with the workload.

At 1116 GMT there are questions to J. Paleckis. Most deputies agree that the parliament of this republic should not remain an amateur body as it used to be.

At 1225 GMT Vitautas Landsbergis is heard reading an improved version of the appeal to Lithuanian people concerning the Soviet Armed Forces.

Election Timing Debated

LD1903181190

[Editorial Report] Vilnius Domestic Service in Lithuanian at 1230 GMT on 19 March continues its live relay from the Lithuanian Supreme Council session in Vilnius.

At 1241 GMT a deputy is heard reading a statement concerning gross violations of local election laws in the Kelme Rayon constituency. A decision is taken to urgently deal with this violation.

Other difficulties expected during the election of local government are then discussed, such as avoiding repeat elections.

At 1248 GMT proposals are voiced that elections to local governments should be postponed because of the difficult political situation.

AT 1250 GMT Deputy Pavilionis speaks about the provisional commission for matters concerning the eastern areas of Lithuania. He gives the names of the commission.

At 1254 GMT V. Landsbergis gives a short report about a phone call made by Vaitotas Antanaitis from Moscow. He says that the answer has not yet been handed in to Gorbachev because Gorbachev is not there. V. Landsbergis says that he is pleased to hear that the USSR Supreme Soviet is taking the developments in Lithuania calmly. He also comments on speeches made at the pro-Russian rally which took place in Vilnius. He says that Professor Burokevicius was telling lies in Moscow about bourgeoisie power being restored in Lithuania.

At 1303 GMT the session is adjourned until tomorrow at 0800 GMT.

USSR Issues Statement on Lithuania

LD1903190690 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1840 GMT 19 Mar 90

[Text] Moscow, 19 Mar (TASS)—We are transmitting the text of a statement by the Soviet Government on Lithuania. It says:

The extraordinary Third Congress of USSR People's Deputies found invalid the legislative acts adopted by the Supreme Soviet of the Lithuanian Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR] "On Restoration of an Independent Lithuanian State," and also on annulling the effect of the Constitution of the Lithuanian SSR and of the USSR Constitution on the republic's territory.

Information coming in from the republic shows that plans are being worked out, as a matter of urgency, to change the status of union-administered enterprises, to transfer state enterprises to private ownership, to introduce their own currency, create a customs service, and so on. By this token, steps are being taken which undermine the ties between the Lithuanian SSR's economy and the country's national economic complex. The consequences of such actions might have ruinous effects on the general socioeconomic situation in the republic, and on the situation for working people and other strata of the population.

Attaching great importance to the stable functioning of the Lithuanian SSR economy and, above all, the establishments connected with providing the republic's population with essential goods and services, the USSR Government draws attention to the danger of breaking the ties established between the enterprises of the Lithuanian Soviet Socialist Republic and the enterprises of other Union Republics. Normal economic relations demand the unswerving fulfillment of the mutual contractual obligations for the supplies of all kinds of output, and the fulfillment of the 1990 production programs.

At the same time, the USSR Government stresses that all Union-administered establishments situated on Lithuanian Soviet Socialist Republic territory are the property of the USSR.

Their status, designation, and conditions of operation cannot be altered by unilateral decisions by republican bodies. In connection with this, the permanent bodies of the USSR Council of Ministers, ministries, and departments of the USSR have been instructed not to enter into any negotiations whatsoever on the transfer of the enterprises and organizations within their jurisdiction to the jurisdiction of the Lithuanian SSR. Management of the aforementioned installations under all-Union ownership will be carried out directly by USSR ministries.

Attaching particular significance to ensuring the safety of the operation of nuclear power installations and other very important sites that are all-Union property, the relevant bodies have been instructed to step up cardinally the guard on the above sites.

The USSR Government has tasked the Railways, Merchant Marine, Fisheries, and Civil Aviation Ministries to ensure the uninterrupted work of all-Union level transportation communications in the interests of the population of the Lithuanian SSR and also that of the Kaliningrad Oblast of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic, and the interests of transit shipments via the port of Klaipeda.

The main customs administration, the Ministry of Internal Affairs, and the USSR KGB have been instructed to ensure that the established customs regulations are implemented on the territory of the Lithuanian SSR.

The USSR Council of Ministers gives notice that the adoption of decisions by republican organs that disrupt the unity of the country's financial and credit system and the USSR's foreign economic relations will be considered contradictory to the USSR legislation in force and to the interests of the Union republics and the Union as a whole.

While relating with understanding to the problems of political, socioeconomic, and ethnic and cultural development of the Lithuanian SSR and respecting the aspiration of its people to renew society and strengthen the republic's sovereignty, the USSR Government considers that the resolution of these tasks is only possible through strict observance of USSR legislation and taking into account the mutual interests of peoples of the Lithuanian SSR and other republics.
[Signed] N. Ryzhkov, chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers.

Landsbergis 19 Mar Council Statement

LD1903112690 Vilnius Domestic Service in Lithuanian 0909 GMT 19 Mar 90

[Statement by Vitautas Landsbergis, chairman of the Lithuanian Supreme Council, at 19 March Lithuanian Supreme Council session in Vilnius—live]

[Text] Good day, fellow deputies. I wish to make my brief statement with a review of a very beautiful and very noble greeting which I am going to read:

Vilnius; to the Supreme Council and Government of the Republic of Lithuania. The Lithuanian Catholic Church, expressing the mood of the great majority of our people, is today uniting in spirit with all those who are joyous at the restoration of the Lithuanian state. We, the members of the Lithuanian Bishops' Conference, on behalf of all Catholics, express full confidence and support to those who have been invited by God's providence and the nation's trust to lead the Lithuanian state at this decisive period of time. We believe that you will always express the spirit of the great men of our nation—Dr. Jonas Basanavicius, Antanas Smetona, and others, our nation's politicians in 1918—the spirit which at that time gave rise to Lithuania's independence, united the nation, and urged it to creative toil against all Goliaths who are threatening our nation with their power and who wish to enslave it once again. We are coming out as a small David of the chosen nation and saying: You are coming against us with a sword, and we, although unarmed, are going to create an independent Lithuania. [passage indistinct].
[Signed] Lithuania's cardinal and bishops. [applause]

I think that this is a document of great moral and political significance. We see these days that attempts are being made to present our steps toward the consolidation of independence in a distorted manner, as if we do not express the will of all or the majority of Lithuanian citizens. The Catholic Church confirms that the great majority of Lithuanian people are with us.

Now I can return to the problems which I mentioned before: The stabilization of the political situation as a guarantee of the citizens' well-being, the functioning of all aspects of life, and the stability of the situation as a guarantee of the recognition of the independence of Lithuania and of the government.

Today, it seems, foreign states will examine our appeal to the governments of democratic states. Political work starts on Monday at the U.S. Congress, where an examination of the appeal is intended in the House of Representatives, then in the Senate, and also in the government offices of other states. Here I must draw the attention of us all and of everyone who can hear us, to the fact that the principle, which is often repeated by representatives of foreign states, that the condition of recognizing a state is complete control over the territory can be interpreted in different ways. In order to hinder the recognition of the decisions made by our government, it may be suggested that we introduce stricter control over a part of the territory or dispute it, and thus delay the recognition of independent Lithuania and its government.

Such a political game is not difficult to play in the meetings which were organized in Vilnius and Klaipeda, with military exercises aimed at increasing and which really have increased tension, and through provocative acts of servicemen or people wearing military uniforms in the eastern and western parts of Lithuania. I am going to comment on these matters.

I make these comments while thinking that we should instruct the Council of Ministers of the Lithuanian Republic to appeal directly to the USSR minister of defense, asking him to explain whether he knows which servicemen—and whether they are servicemen, and if servicemen, then on whose instructions—are traveling in the territory of Lithuania and speaking about the establishment of new borders of the Republic of Lithuania. I

call this a provocation, a provocation on an exceptionally large international and global scale. Because if somebody interprets this as being done on the instructions of the Soviet Government, and even with the knowledge of the president himself, the Soviet Union would be the first state, the first among the great states, which claims to change the borders, and thus violates the principles of the Helsinki Final Act.

I think that there is no need to comment on how the Soviet Union, which has talked for many years about the Helsinki principles and their development into the idea of the common and just European home, would look in the eyes of the world. It would look like a complete hypocrisy. A specific aspect of this problem would be an attempt to raise any doubts about the Klaipeda region.

If somebody could prove that the Soviet Union recognizes the ultimate seizure of the Klaipeda region carried out by Hitlerite Germany, the question could arise to the effect of whether the Soviet Union also would have the same attitude toward the seizure of the Sudetenland, of all Czechoslovakia, and of Austria. These events happened at the same time, an aggressive expansion of Hitlerite Germany at the same time.

Although at that time the Soviet Union and Germany proclaimed themselves to be friendly states and even became allies in starting World War II, I think that the Soviet Union cannot accept such a legacy for itself. Meanwhile, any talk about treating the Klaipeda region as a former German territory shows that the Soviet Union recognized German aggression against other states, with the exception of itself. Therefore, I am sure that these provocations will cease soon. I wish to invite the people of Lithuania to treat suspicious people wearing military uniform who emerge in the Klaipeda region or in eastern Lithuania with restraint. We on our part must discover on whose instructions this is being carried out.

Recently I have had direct contacts with high-ranking military leaders. Yesterday I was visited by Colonel General Kuzmin, commander of the Baltic Military Okrug; Colonel General Ochalov, commander of the paratroop units; and two other high-ranking officials. The objects of their concern are also the deployment of military units made up of young soldiers and the political tension that could arise in connection with former or present military personnel serving or residing in the Republic of Lithuania. Many young people who have left their units do not create problems for the executive organs of the Republic of Lithuania. These are people who have no documents and who have not managed to reach the homes of their parents, although they wish to return there. The minister of internal affairs, the esteemed Misiukonis, has taken measures to register these young people and to supply them with some kind of temporary certificates. This is a correct step, and a wish has been expressed to us that these young people should be returned to military units.

Of course, it was essential to explain that if this is done, not a single young person would come to the Ministry of Internal Affairs in the future. Therefore, we are not going to do this, neither the Republic of Lithuania nor its Ministry of Internal Affairs. The problem is being solved this way: that young persons agree to return, especially those who do not have to serve for a long time, and that there is no need for them to risk some unpleasant steps. They know that the Republic of Lithuania, basing itself on its laws, will defend them. It is understandable that the parents are concerned; the parents urge them to return and finish their service. When this happens, there is no problem. Nobody reproaches them, and they are not punished.

You know that we have adopted an appeal that those who are serving in the Armed Forces should continue their service until their fate is decided in negotiations with the Soviet Union on their safe return to Lithuania. Absence without leave can be very dangerous. I understand that their stay there can be dangerous, too. I have drawn this to the attention of Col Gen Kuzmin. I asked him to issue a special instuction to the commanders and political leaders of all units where young people from Lithuania are serving, that the atmosphere there should be controlled, and that servicemen should be particularly instructed that the position of our young men has changed. Contacts must be very sensitive and humane.

I also have drawn attention to the fact that any event, especially with tragic consequences, would now become an international problem.

The kidnapping of people from the territory of the Republic of Lithuania may also become such a problem. There has been a case where officers wearing civilian clothing attempted to abduct a young person, a former soldier, from a mental hospital in Naujoji Vilnia, where he was undergoing treatment. They were familiar with this case, but I told them that such steps lower the name of "officer" and tarnish the Soviet Army. One can hope that such things will not be repeated.

This conversation also meant an occasion dwelling on other problems, too, such as veterans of the military service and pensioners who are concerned about their future. Their concern is understandable. There are many rumors. [passage indistinct]

Every person of advanced years who resides in Lithuania in accordance with our law, has the right to become a citizen of Lithuania, and can rest assured that his work [words indistinct] will be recognized.

Rumors that servicemen and their families will be urged to leave their apartments are groundless. We respect human rights, we respect our laws, and those who spread such rumors take the responsibility upon themselves. I wish once again to address those who are listening to me that we must be [words indistinct] that these people are the participants in events, and that they found themselves in a new situation not of their own free will. There must not be any quarrels, insults, or discussions.

Friendly conversations are very essential, and I propose that the deputies should find time within the next few days to meet servicemen in their units, garrisons, etc. I think that this is essential. I wish that this could be decided today.

On my part, I had to remind Col Gen Kuzmin that there is a bad feeling among the veterans, servicemen, and reserve officers. There is also some incitement. [passage indistinct]. This should not happen. The depolitization of the Armed Forces is very desirable. Until the political forces solve the problem of Lithuania, there must not be any propaganda among the servicemen.

About those who travel in Lithuanian rayons and measure land or territory, I [words indistinct]. About the noise which was raised yesterday in the Vilnius sky [words indistinct]. I hope that not a single sensitive person or person of advanced age became ill. I drew the attention of Col Gen Ochalov, who explained that these were the simplest and most normal exercises. It would be very good to know about such exercises in advance. It would be even better if it were possible to change their date so that they do not coincide with very important political events in Lithuania. Unfortunately, I did not receive an agreement to my request that the exercises should be made known in advance in the future. However, the conversation was friendly—I would say more friendly than the initial contacts after our decisions.

There was a wish, and it is justified, that we should make a statement on the status of the Soviet Armed Forces in the Republic of Lithuania, a status [words indistinct] and appeal to the Lithunian society. Such an appeal would help to eliminate the mood of suspicion or distrust among the servicemen.

Lithuanian Leadership Rejects Congress Decision

LD1903184890 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1800 GMT 19 Mar 90

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] On the situation in the Lithuanian Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR], a reply addressed to Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, president of the USSR, has been received from the leadership of the Lithuanian SSR, which reports the attitude of the republican Supreme Soviet to the resolution of the extraordinary Third Congress of USSR People's Deputies of 15 March this year. It says:

1. The Congress' definition of the decision of the Lithuanian Republic's decision as invalid has no legal foundation.

2. Human rights in Lithuania are guaranteed by the laws of the Lithuanian Republic, which are in line with all the recognized norms and agreements, and are defended by the government and the courts of the Lithuanian Republic. The legitimate interests of the USSR in Lithuania must be specifically determined by negotiations, and they will be diligently observed by the Lithuanian Republic.

3. The Lithuanian state is taking steps to ensure that law and order on the territory of the Lithuanian Republic are not violated.

Taking advantage of this opportunity, the reply from Lithuania's leadership says: I draw your attention, very resepected president, to the fact that a number of speeches at the Third Congress of USSR People's Deputies, made on 15 March 1990, and relayed over USSR Central Television, did not portray the truth and bore the character of interference. We have always expected and still expect all problems of state relations to be settled by political means alone, placing the highest price on peaceability and amicability.

As is evident from the reply from Lithuania's leadership, the demand that steps be taken to implement the resolution of the extraordinary Third Congress of USSR People's Deputies has in essence been ignored. Information coming in bears witness to the fact that the republic's present leadership has embarked on the road of crude violations of constitutional order, and of arbitrarily deciding questions which affect the interests of the USSR. In connection with this, the USSR president has instructed the USSR Government to implement a number of immediate measures ensuing from the resolution of the Third Congress of People's Deputies and from the situation which is taking shape.

Frolov Comments on Lithuanian Secession Issue

LD1903211390 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1810 GMT 19 Mar 90

[Text] Moscow, 19 Mar (TASS)—The independence of the Soviet republics can and must develop within the framework of the Federation. This idea was stressed by Ivan Frolov, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, chief editor of PRAVDA, at a traditional press conference for Soviet and foreign journalists today.

Touching on the situation in Lithuania, the Central Committee secretary commented that the leadership of the republic is simplifying the problems connected with seceding from the USSR. He described the steps being taken by the Lithuanian Supreme Soviet as "ill-considered and hasty." He recalled that during the years of Soviet power, huge changes had taken place in the social and economic sphere in Lithuania, which were achieved thanks to the efforts of representatives of many peoples. Hundreds of thousands of non-Lithuanians live in the republic, and their destiny cannot but be a subject of concern for the state leadership of the USSR.

Replying to questions relating to the recent CPSU Central Committee Plenum, Ivan Frolov stressed every party can exist as a union of like-minded people. "But we recognize the possibility of dissent," he commented. "A different point of view cannot be suppressed, as occurred

in the past. Differences of opinions are admissible between communists. The question is, till when?" In this connection Ivan Frolov condemned the position of Yuriy Afanasyev, member of the CPSU, co-chairman of the opposition Interregional Group, who in a speech at the Congress of USSR People's Deputies last week made a number of accusations against V.I. Lenin, the founder of the CPSU. The secretary of the CPSU Central Committee considers that Afanasyev should leave the CPSU.

Lithuanian Citizens Group Appeals to Gorbachev

LD1903204590 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1835 GMT 19 Mar 90

[Text] Moscow, 19 Mar (TASS)—On 18 March a rally of citizens from the capital of Lithuania and from the Vilnius area took place in Vilnius; 180,000 people took part in the rally. During the rally an appeal to USSR President Mikhail Gorbachev and members of the USSR Supreme Soviet was adopted.

We appeal to you in days that are difficult and bitter for us, our loved ones and those close to us, for all citizens of the USSR, the document says.

The leaders of "Sajudis" who have become established in the Lithuanian Soviet Socialist Republic Supreme Soviet, in fact carried out an anticonstitutional revolution [perevorot] on 10-12 March 1990. They declared the severing of ties with the USSR—our common multiethnic motherland. Illegal legislative acts, that are dismantling the Soviet structure and condemning the working people to unjustified deprivations and sufferings in the name of satisfying the egoistic ambitions of antisocialist forces, are being adopted in haste. Moreover, the interests of many thousands of citizens who are categorically opposed to being torn away from the peoples of the USSR and are convinced of the correctness of the socialist choice made in October 1917, are being haughtily and hypocritically ignored.

For decades we, people of diverse nationalities, have lived on the land of Lithuania and have labored for the well-being of its peoples and the peoples of our whole country. We have given and are ready to continue giving our knowledge and strength to the cause of creating a humane and democratic socialism, and to strive for the prosperity of a sovereign Soviet Lithuania as part of a renewed federation of equal Soviet peoples.

Supporting each nation's right to self-determination unconditionally right up to state separation, we express our firm conviction that a mechanism to implement this in practice should be created, such as would guarantee the realization in full value of the legitimate interests of the smallest people, of all national groups and of each individual.

Therefore, we wholeheartedly support the decision of the extraordinary Third Congress of USSR People's Deputies on the decisions of the Lithuanian Supreme Soviet of 10-12 March, and express the hope and conviction that you, comrade president, and you, comrade members of the USSR Supreme Soviet, will ensure that this document is realized immediately and effectively.

In the USSR Supreme Soviet there are currently no deputies representing and defending our interests, our needs and hopes. Owing to the antidemocratic nature of the recent election campaign and the whole situation in the republic, they make up only an insignificant minority of the Lithuanian Supreme Soviet. That is why we have formed a committee of USSR citizens in Lithuania which we empower to represent and defend our interests. We want to discuss and to solve all the issues of Lithuania's future, that involve our interests, with mandatory participation of this committee which should enjoy full rights.

For the purpose of conveying our proposals we ask that representatives of this committee be received at the USSR Supreme Soviet and be given an opportunity to speak at its session in the near future.

Comrade president, comrade members of the USSR Supreme Soviet, we believe and have a solid hope that, relying upon the will and support of the whole Soviet people, you will be able to protect your citizens against encroachments by political adventurers.

The rally also adopted a resolution in support of the decision of the extraordinary Third Congress of USSR People's Deputies.

International Communications Cut From Lithuania

LD1903171190 Vilnius Domestic Service in Lithuanian 1400 GMT 19 Mar 90

[Interview with Lithuanian Minister of Communications Jonas Kuzma by correspondent Benas Rupeika; date and place not given—recorded]

[Text] [Rupeika] I have not seen you for some time at the Supreme Council. You have been away, and rather far.

[Kuzma] Yes, I was in Denmark. The aim of my trip was to endeavor to look for opportunities to establish direct communications with other states.

[Rupeika] You mean telephone and telegraph.
[Kuzma] Of course.
Rupeika] Why do we need these direct communications?

[Kuzma] This is testified by the fact that after my return from that country I received the news that, for the purpose of prevention, as our Muscovites said, there are no international communications in Lithuania.

[Rupeika] And how long has this been going on?

[Kuzma] Since Saturday. Thanks to our neighbors, Latvians and Estonians, to whom this prevention has not been applied, we were allowed to use communications by the Latvians and Estonians.

[Rupeika] But this is an exception.

[Kuzma] This is an exception, but the communications of the Latvians and Estonians also go through Moscow.

[Rupeika] And what is the influence of the closing of these communications to Lithuania?

[Kuzma] I think it is difficult to imagine our life without communications, especially at present when these communications should serve the establishment of new contacts.

[Rupeika] And the results of your trip to Denmark?

[Kuzma] The results are rather good. We succeeded in establishing opportunities for possible solutions. These solutions can be practical. From the technical point of view it would be essential to lay a cable line from Warsaw to Kaunas or Vilnius, and this way—since the Warsaw-Copenhagen line goes into service this year and, as is known, Copenhagen is an important center of international communications—it would be possible to solve the problem of international communications, avoiding Moscow.

[Rupeika] But a cable line from Warsaw to Kaunas would not be easy to implement, furthermore, as the border is guarded by USSR soldiers?

[Kuzma] Of course, but it seems there is no other way. All other solutions can be only temporary. The cable line which would link us with Warsaw is, to my mind, the artery of our life. To realize this project we would need roughly one and one-half years. This is the opinion of Danish experts. Another question is that it would cost a great deal. I have in mind about $4.5 million. At the same time, soundings were made in Denmark on who could grant credits for this construction, and who would grant aid as for a developing country.

[Rupeika] And were there any people willing to do this?

[Kuzma] Of course, we do not have any concrete addressee. But in principle, people whom we met and talked to have a very favorable attitude to the events taking place in Lithuania, and promise to help sincerely in these problems.

[Rupeika] But time is passing. We need communications today, tomorrow, and the day after tomorrow.

[Kuzma] I agree. Together with the first deputy minister, esteemed Antanas Vaida, we have discussed how, maybe, one of the existing radio relay lines in Lithuania should be orientated in the direction of Warsaw.

More on Communications Blockade

LD1903233690 Vilnius in English to Europe 2230 GMT 19 Mar 90 (tentative)

[Text] We have reliable information that in the past two days Radio Vilnius broadcasts to foreign countries have been stopped by Radio Moscow. For many years now the External Service of Radio Vilnius in the Lithuanian and English languages has been using the powerful system of relay stations based in various parts of the Soviet Union. Thanks to these relay stations, our programs could be heard in more than 50 countries of the world. Besides shortwave frequencies, Radio Vilnius programs in Lithuanian and English are also broadcast on medium wave through relatively weak transmitters based in Lithuania. Their signal strength, however, is sufficient to be heard in northern Europe, West Germany, and Great Britain.

As these transmitters are located in Lithuania we advise all Radio Vilnius listeners in Europe to tune in to these medium-wave broadcasts. Today the leadership of the Lithuanian radio and TV network, as well as Radio Vilnius people have been getting in touch with high- or low-ranking officials from Radio Moscow. It appears that the blockade of Radio Vilnius broadcasts was a surprise for them and they promised to clear up what the matter was. This suggests that perhaps the blockade of Radio Vilnius broadcasts abroad is not conducted by Radio Moscow but by the Ministry of Communications of the USSR and so far no answer from that Ministry has been received.

Anticommunism in Lithuania Deplored by Paper

PM2003123490 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 20 Mar 90 p 1

[V. Zarovskiy article: "Lithuania: What Next?"]

[Text] Vilnius, 19 Mar—Every session of the Lithuanian Supreme Soviet begins with a report by its chairman on the political situation in the republic. This situation is still not very calm. There have been rallies in Klaypeda, Snechkus, and Vilnius. Some people are protesting, others supporting the innovations. Meanwhile parliament has adopted a resolution on the invalidity of the USSR Law on Universal Military Service, announced the cessation of the operation of military commissariats, and transferred to Lithuania's jurisdiction enterprises, institutions, and organizations under union and union republican control.

Of course, this haste leads to certain misgivings. But that is not all. Many people regard political steps as practical steps. And so young Lithuanians are already deserting their military units...

Some people at the session have already permitted themselves to attack the communists. What about the question that sprang up out of nowhere about D. Shnyukas, chairman of the State Committee for Television and Radio Broadcasting? Some deputies, accusing him of being a communist, which means that television and radio are in the hands of the Communist Party, demanded his removal. Although for the last two years television has always been accused of the reverse.

In fact, the Law on the Press that was adopted only two months ago merely legitimized what has been the practice in Lithuania recently. The first Sajudis leaflets of June 1988 soon turned into a torrent of newspapers and

magazines. Every rayon had one or even two publications, and in the cities there were dozens. Little Lithuania, with a population of just over 4 million, now has more than 640 newspapers and magazines. If there is a reader, there is a publisher, as they say. A free press is a guarantee of progress, criticism of the government is as necessary as cleaning your teeth in the morning. But apparently the "toothpaste" has run out. Sajudis itself, on taking the helm of power, transferred its press from opposition into a fixed position. The only remaining critics were a few weak Interfront [International Front] publications, because the two republican newspapers in Russian and Polish were recently handed over to the Supreme Soviet by the Communist Party. Only TIESA remains. After the screening of a television reportage—an ordinary, objective reportage—on letters and telegrams sent to A. Brazauskas during the first session of the new Supreme Soviet, a group of deputies turned up at the television studio to investigate, without having been empowered to do so by anyone. The television company was severely reprimanded, and there was an atmosphere of "witch hunts."

The anticommunism of former communists, like the aggressive sobriety of drunkards and the virtue of the dissolute, is not only dishonest and shameful, but dangerous. In order to rid themselves of their sin (is it a sin?), they are prepared to forget it as quickly as possible, but also to persuade everyone else that it was only youthful mischief. P. Brazhenas, secretary of the Lithuanian Writers' Union board, a Sajudis member, described the attitude to members of the Communist Party and Sajudis thus, in the newspaper ATGIMIMAS: "Today political interests are unfortunately overpowering historical objectivity. And therefore you see people in Sajudis who would go to any lengths to suppress the fact that half the initiative group (which set up Sajudis) was made up of communists. And in the party, even the renewed, autonomous Lithuanian Communist Party, some people are frankly irritated by the fact that without Sajudis this renewal would not have happened. Because what we have here, I repeat, is not a quest for objective historical truth, but an area of operation of subjective political interests, and no one listens to arguments."

True, they follow the same path, as is stated in program documents. The slogan "A Lithuania without sovereignty is a Lithuania without a future" appeared on the Lithuanian Communist Party Central Committee last year. Behind the broad back of A. Brazauskas, people felt confident and calm. The Communists' cautious policy ensured political "fair weather" for the republic. But apparently the Communist Party is now assigned only the role of a fellow traveler. Some people use the analogy of a pendulum, which has now swung away from the communists, so as to come to rest later somewhere in the middle. The amplitude of the swing is worrying. On his second day in office as Lithuanian Supreme Soviet chairman, V. Landsbergis stated: "But some people, especially leaders of political forces, are perceived as representatives of those political forces who sympathize with and express the essence of those political forces. Therefore, if the sympathies of some people in Lithuania, perhaps the great sympathy for the esteemed Algirdas Brazauskas, were interpreted, especially on an international scale, as an inclination toward the political line represented by the leader of that political group, this would result in a large question mark over what is happening in Lithuania and what the people of Lithuania really want. Perhaps they want the Communist Party to continue to govern them?"

Even before the elections it was clear that the Lithuanian Communist Party was losing power. Sajudis, although it consisted of numerous parties and alliances, formed a united front in the election marathon, ridding itself of vacillators and anyone inconvenient. And so it has remained in parliament—monolithic. In the event of an approaching disagreement between it and the Lithuanian Communist Party, the majority vote machinery is switched on. The communists have already begun to express dissatisfaction with this situation, but have not gone as far as confrontation. There is no contest of opinions, platforms, and concepts. Obviously this is because of the persisting "Sajudis syndrome," whereby the Lithuanian movement for perestroyka was the personification of the people. But is this the case now?

On the day that the government was formed, the newspaper RESPUBLIKA—one of the few that dare to criticize the new parliament—carried a cartoon entitled "The Lithuanian Lambada." A maestro sits at the piano, looking very much like the present Supreme Soviet chairman, and puppets dance around him. There is a grain of truth in this picture. The parliament is made up of deputies drawn solidly from among Sajudis supporters, and Sajudis discusses everything, even the candidacies for a particular post. That is what happened with the appointment of the Council of Ministers chairman. Furthermore V. Landsbergis, before introducing the contender for this post, reported that he had received a telegram from overseas, from an American Lithuanian, who reported: The U.S. Congress intends to give financial aid to East European countries, but since the Council of Ministers is still headed by K. Prunskene, a communist and member of the Lithuanian Communist Party Central Committee Bureau, the Lithuanian Government is also considered communist, and therefore cannot count on receiving credits.

Communist deputies were unable to ascertain how far the telegram can be considered official.

Yu. Urbshis, an old politican and diplomat, foreign minsiter of the Lithuanian (bourgeois) Republic, who is still alive, sent the Supreme Soviet a telegram, which was read out on Saturday before the evening session closed. The old man, over 90, who headed the talks with Stalin before the war and served his term in the camps, apparently felt there was something wrong, and wrote that you should not throw stones at people solely because they are called communists. "Esteemed Landsbergis and Brazauskas and vice versa..." he goes on.

It is only the Supreme Soviet that has a problem with "vice versa." In order not to split the people and sow discord, A. Brazauskas agreed to accept the post of deputy premier: "I think the Communist Party members and the Lithuanian people will understand." On the same day he said at a press conference that he will concentrate his activities mainly in the Council of Ministers, and it is for the plenum to decide whether he remains in the post of first secretary of the Lithuanian Communist Party Central Committee. But what about the government? Will it be a coalition? Who knows, if even the Commission for Protection of the State and Internal Affairs is headed by a young "Green," while the Foreign Affairs Commission is headed by the chairman of the Jewish cultural society.

Party Activities Suspended in Official Services

90UN1122B Moscow RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA in Russian 4 Mar 90 p 2

[Article by R. Motskus, Vilnius: "Leaving the Party"]

[Text] The Bureau of the Central Committee of the Lithuanian Communist Party has decided to suspend the activity of party members in organizations of the Ministry of Internal Affairs [MVD], KGB, and customs service, and in the organs of the Justice Ministry.

The resolution adopted on this matter states that organizations of the Lithuanian Communist Party in the enumerated law-and-order organs are eliminated. Prior to 1 April 1990 they will hand over files and documents of party members to the territorial party committees.

Sajudis Official, Ligachev Questioned on Lithuania

AU1603160690 Prague RUDE PRAVO in Czech 14 Mar 90 p 14

[Zdenek Zuntych report: "Sajudis Assembly Council Member: 'We Already Are a Different State'"]

[Text] Moscow (from our correspondent)—Despite the fact that the situation that has arisen from Lithuania's proclamation of independence does not figure on the adopted agenda of the Third Congress of People's Deputies, it is, except for the establishment of the presidency, the most frequent topic of conversation. And it was precisely the independence of Lithuania which I discussed with Professor Vaidotas Antanaitis, a member of the Sajudis Assembly Council.

[Zuntych] Mikhail Gorbachev said that talks can be held only with a foreign state, hence no talks with you are possible. What is your opinion?

[Antanaitis] We seceded from the USSR, thus we are an entirely different state. Therefore, we see the only possible path to agreement in mutual talks.

[Zuntych] What would you like to discuss with the USSR?

[Antanaitis] Everything. Economics tops the list, because it is intertwined with that of the USSR, but cultural, scientific, and military cooperation should be discussed as well as transport, harbors, etc.

[Zuntych] The center speaks, however, of the tremendous debt you will have.

[Antanaitis] We have outstanding claims against the USSR which will cover our debts several times over. This regards unlawful acts against Lithuanian people, expropriation of the entire gold reserves, etc, in addition to the work which Lithuanians already provided for the USSR and by which they redeemed themselves.

[Zuntych] Will the Lithuanian deputies cede their activities in the Supreme Soviet of the USSR?

[Antanaitis] Our status is not exactly determined. Thus far we are observers as we are here at the congress.

[Zuntych] I heard some views questioning the status of Klaipeda as part of Lithuania. What is your opinion?

[Antanaitis] Those are fabrications dreamed up to complicate our situation. Klaipeda lies on Lithuanian soil and belongs to us.

This, then, is the Lithuanian point of view. The Soviet standpoint is only taking shape. The opinion of Yegor Ligachev, a secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, with whom we spoke on this topic, is not without interest in this context. Ligachev believes that a law must be worked out which would help bring to life the self-determination right which is incorporated in the constitution. According to him, it is necessary to act and solve the matter by political means. "Tanks will not help this affair. We have had our lesson in this respect."

Opinions may differ but the important thing is that both sides intend to resolve the conflict politically without resorting to force.

Lithuania's Zukas Comments on Secession

LD1603154190 Moscow World Service in English 0810 GMT 16 Mar 90

[Text] The newly elected Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev said in his inauguration speech there was a pressing need to work out a new treaty of the Union which would provide a sound basis for the unity of all the Soviet republics as members of a single union. At the same time, President Gorbachev said each republic should make up [words indistinct] union or leave it. The mechanism and procedures for doing so would be determined by the USSR parliament with the president. Our reporter put in a call to Vilnius, the capital of Lithuania, which recently proclaimed itself a sovereign and independent state, and spoke to Algimantas Zukas, a spokesman for the independent Lithuanian Communist Party. Asked how he viewed the problem of working out such mechanism, he replied:

[Begin Zukas recording, in Lithuanian fading to English translation] I am not all that sure a mutually acceptable mechanism will be worked out, but I am convinced that there must be a broad consensus in this field. We are saying that the mechanism regulating the secession of a republic should be balanced by another mechanism regulating a republic's decision to become part of the Soviet Union. In 1940, when Lithuania was incorporated in the USSR contrary to its people's will, there was no such mechanism. That has been acknowledged by the republic, so the procedure for working it out must be approached from this point of view. [end recording]

Algimantas Zukas saw a contradiction in the fact that while the mechanism is to be worked out in Moscow, decisions to secede have been taken by the republics—Lithuania, Estonia, and Georgia—and what is most important in his view is that mechanism should envisage all the aspects of recognizing each republic's distinct statehood. Late Monday the Lithuanian parliament drafted a letter to Moscow asking for recognition of Lithuania's independence and for talks on restoring its sovereignty. The immediate reaction in Moscow was a statement by the Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev that we can conduct talks only with foreign states. This was his reaction before he was elected president of the Soviet Union. More about this from Algimantas Zukas.

[Begin Zukas recording, in Lithuanian fading into English translation] His election demonstrates that he is the man with whom we should conduct talks and determine the procedure of secession. [end recording]

The head of the USSR State Planning Committee, Yuriy Maslyukov, when asked about the possible consequences of Lithuania's decision, said the Soviet Union would bill the republic in hard currency for Soviet investments in industry and infrastructure during the past half century to the tune of 21 billion rubles or 34 billion dollars. The immediate reaction from the republic was a statement that it would in turn bill the USSR for the people killed during Stalin's rule and for the economic havoc caused by half a century of mismanagement. Is this tit for tat policy effective and will it help us to find a way out of the deadlock? Algimantas Zukas?

[Begin Zukas recording, in Lithuanian fading into English translation] Our politicians and economists are studying all aspects of the procedure, but of course if the issue of sending us a bill does arise we would respond in kind. [end recording]

Spokesman for the independent Lithuanian Communist Party, Algimantas Zukas.

Council Issues Decree on Religious Buildings

90UN1116A Vilnius SOVETSKAYA LITVA in Russian 24 Feb 90 p 1

[Lithuanian Soviet Socialist Republic Law, signed 14 February 1990 in Vilnius: "On Returning Meeting Houses and Other Buildings to Religious Societies"]

[Text] The Supreme Soviet of the Lithuanian SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] **decrees:**

1. To repeal the 19 June 1948 Edict of the Lithuanian SSR Supreme Soviet Presidium "On the Nationalization of Meeting Houses and Buildings of Monasteries and of Residences of Religious Societies."

2. To require rayon and city soviets of people's deputies to discuss at their sessions the issue of returning nationalized meeting houses to religious societies and to discuss the issue of resolving the social, cultural, domestic, and other problems of state and social institutions and organizations and of the population in this regard.

3. To instruct the administrative organs of rayon and city soviets of people's deputies as well as the ministries, departments, enterprises, and organizations that have authority over nationalized religious buildings and houses of monasteries and religious societies to come to agreement by 1 July 1990 with religious centers and societies and to define dates for the return of buildings or monetary compensation, as well as to define the transfer and construction of other buildings or other measures which will contribute to the gradual return of accommodations belonging to churches and religious organizations.

Enterprises, institutions, organizations, and citizens subject to eviction must be presented with other suitable accommodations.

4. The Lithuanian SSR Council of Ministers is instructed to supervise the implementation of this resolution.
[Signed] A. Brazauskas, chairman of the Lithuanian SSR Supreme Soviet Presidium
L. Sabutis, secretary of the Lithuanian SSR Supreme Soviet Presidium.

Toome Discusses Meeting With Party Officials

LD2003122590 Tallinn Domestic Service in Estonian 1800 GMT 19 Mar 90

[Text] [Unidentified reporter] Estonian Prime Minister Indrek Toome will comment on the meeting that took place today at the CPSU Central Committee, Juhan Virkus will question him by telephone.

[Toome] [Words indistinct] a very interesting meeting, namely in the building of the Central Committee itself, in the Hall of the Secretariat, with the participation of—on behalf of the CPSU Central Committee—Mikhail Gorbachev, Ligachev, Zaykov, Medvedev, Razumovskiy, Girenko, Stroyev, Belousov, Frolov, and Pugo; these are all either members of the Politburo or secretaries of the Central Committee. And, on the part of Estonia: a group of members and candidate members of the Bureau of the Communist Party of Estonia Central Committee—Valjas, Ruutel, Titma, Aleshin, Vali, Sillari, Allik, Chetvergov, Cherevashko, and myself. The subject of the conversation was the forthcoming 20th

congress of the Communist Party of Estonia, and naturally the thoughts on and analysis of that congress, that will be under scrutiny and will be used to evaluate the current political and economic reality in Estonia.

[Virkus] As you said, Indrek Toome, political issues still occupy the top places, but we Estonians are interested, of course, in the relationship with the East in the economic sphere as well.

[Toome] I believe that for many people the economic problems that are of prime importance are namely those that are becoming worse and worse at present, and that bring along a decline in living standards. There was talk of those as well even if it was to a considerably lesser degree.

But I would say that this took place in two contexts. First, we were asked if we have indeed given careful thought to things, and if our attempt to become independent is not too emotional; do we understand what the consequences may be if our economic links are cut, or, say, worsen? But in the words of some men here, once political relations worsen a worsening of economic relations may also occur. We were asked if we have indeed added everything up correctly with respect to the economic situation, and I have to say that we are naturally, not prepared to answer all the questions that may arise in the course of those talks, during the initial stage. And if my memory serves me right, then it was Ligachev who hinted that several work collectives in many areas of the Union are taking a second look at their relationships with the enterprises of our—that is, the Baltic—region, with respect to whether it would indeed be opportune and wise to procure goods for such areas, and for such enterprises. This is already a very serious question. By the way, talking here to a couple of Lithuanian representatives, they said that this had already been painfully felt.

[Virkus] But this [pauses] issue of the Communist Party of Estonia becoming independent. What was the attitude here, and how was this subject developed?

[Toome] Well, on our part, with respect to both Estonia and the Communist Party of Estonia becoming independent, the talk was plain: Independence is necessary both for the Republic of Estonia and for the Communist Party of Estonia, with its own Constitution and a program of its own. The other side reacted to this in what to me was a calm manner, but in the words of Gorbachev, and in the words of the other speakers on that side, one should indeed still think about elaborating a union contract. There was also a message of this kind from Gorbachev: that with a union contract one could lay down rights for union republics which would be very diverse, and with a very large degree of freedom, a degree of sovereignty. A special situation would be an offer to one or another union republic; the special situation would then depend on what has been written down in the union contract.

[Virkus] In other words, what is being offered is a kind of prisoner status with free movements?

[Toome] Well, yes, so it seems. We voiced our position, and they voiced theirs. I believe that within the next few days a meeting will take place, with Anatoliy Lukyanov then being the leader of the Moscow side—he is the second man in state matters after Gorbachev, within the USSR—and on our side the group would be headed by Arnold Ruutel [chairman of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet]. The conditions under which our meetings could begin to take place would be discussed—or, as we call them, our talks.

Gorbachev Addresses Estonian Party Meeting

LD1903182190 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1752 GMT 19 Mar 90

[Text] Moscow, 19 Mar (TASS)—A meeting of secretaries of the CPSU Central Committee with members and candidate members of the Central Committee Bureau of the Communist Party of Estonia was held today. Matters relating to the forthcoming 20th Congress of the republic's Communist Party were discussed.

During a frank exchange of views it was noted that the sociopolitical situation in the republic continues to be complex and that a polarization of political positions is taking place around problems of the republic's sovereignty and the independence of the Communist Party of Estonia.

The participants in the meeting emphasized the need for very swift decisions that will provide a clear and full answer to anything of real substance that will be imparted to the Federation, which is being renewed, and to the independence of republics' Communist Parties. The need to develop a new Treaty of Union was also noted.

Mikhail Gorbachev spoke at the meeting.

Estonian Supreme Soviet Election Results Reported

LD2003000290 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1600 GMT 19 Mar 90

[Text] Three hundred ninety-two candidates stood for 105 seats in the Estonian Supreme Soviet. Elections took place in all constituencies, according to the preliminary results. By this morning, the first victors of the keen election fight were announced. Vyalyas, first secretary of the Communist Party of Estonia Central Committee; Ruutel, chairman of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet; Toome, chairman of the government; leaders of the People's Front, the Committee for Defense of Soviet Power, and of the United Council of Labor Collectives have been elected Supreme Soviet deputies. Candidates from over 20 parties contested the elections.

Party Leaders Urge Estonia To Avoid Split

AU2003103090 Paris AFP in English 1016 GMT 20 Mar 90

[Text] Moscow, March 20 (AFP)—Soviet leaders trying to talk Estonian communists out of forming a separate

party have warned them against trying to push for independence of the Baltic republic, Estonian sources said Tuesday.

Moscow is trying to persuade Estonian communists not to follow the example of their Lithuanian counterparts and break with the Soviet party.

Talks between Soviet and Estonian party leaders here Monday were "difficult" and went beyond the threatened split in the party to demands for Estonian independence, according to sources at the Estonian Foreign Ministry in Tallinn, the capital of the Baltic republic.

TASS News Agency said strengthened Estonian sovereignty could come only "within a renewed Soviet federation."

Further discussions are to take place in Moscow in the next few days between an Estonian delegation and the new president of the Supreme Soviet, the standing parliament, Anatoliy Lukyanov.

The Estonian party is due to hold a congress on March 23, and wants to split from the Soviet party, as Lithuanian communists did in December.

Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev opposes the move, but sources in Tallinn said: "A sovereign republic must have an independent party."

An Estonian member of parliament contacted by telephone in Tallinn said the talks on Monday lasted four hours. He said Mr. Gorbachev was present at the negotiations with Estonian party chief Vaino Valyas and Prime Minister Indrak Toome.

"The old system isn't working any more, which is why we must move towards independence, but through negotiations," he said. "Everything depends on Moscow. Estonia cannot solve the problem (of independence) alone. We will not try and do like Lithuania."

Demands for independence have been growing in the wake of Lithuania's declaration of independence last week. Estonian nationalists did well in local elections over the weekend, according to preliminary results.

Estonian Front Election Strategies Viewed

90UN1162A Moscow SELSKAYA ZHIZN in Russian 12 Mar 90 p 2

[Article by K. Afanasyev: "The Candidates' Somersaults"]

[Text] Tallinn, 11 March (by telephone)—During the elections to the USSR Supreme Soviet, the leadership of the Estonian People's Front [NFE] thoroughly considered which of the electoral districts could be counted on for victory. Experienced politicians guessed that they might lose in the industrial cities, but that it would not be as difficult to sway the peasants in the country. And they did sway them, having overwhelmed them beforehand with a wave of propaganda on an unprecedented scale: they used television, radio, newspapers, and informational leaflets, as well as meetings with singing and meetings without. As a rule, the majority of candidates from the other movements suffered defeat. Many secretaries of rural party raykoms [rayon committees] and leaders of farms, never mind the dairymaids and tractor drivers who had neither the experience nor the time for an electoral contest, did not receive the necessary support.

In the countryside they came back to reality only after the results had been tallied. There was not a single person from the countryside on the Estonian delegation to the congress of soviets. So a new Law on Elections to the Republic's Supreme Soviet was discussed and they decided to protect the countryside from being plundered by the votes of the electorate—the so-called "dual residency qualification" was imposed on candidates for deputy: Each of them must not only have lived in Estonia a certain number of years, but he must also have been a resident of his electoral district or have worked there.

Someone tried to object: We must send to the Supreme Soviet, he said, advocates who know the law, experienced journalists, and writers. But are there really no experienced jurists on the state and collective farms, and are there no sharp pens on the rayon newspapers? Certainly writers settle down to the countryside, and folk culture takes place in the villages....

The NFE did not even bother to argue: The law is settled, they said, but we will get around it without any problem. And they did get around it! Edgar Savisaar, leader of the NFE, was chairman of the ESSR [Estonian Soviet Socialist Republic] Gosplan [State Planning Committee] when candidates were being registered and he has an apartment in Tallinn worthy of someone in a high post. But he suddenly turned out to be registered in the village of Pyara in Rakvereskiy Rayon. Tiyt Made, the well-known USSR people's deputy, established himself as a consultant at the "Estotsement" factory located 200 kilometers from the Estonian capital. It turns out that Ivar Rayg, secretary of the commission on agriculture of the country's Supreme Soviet, who could always be reached in Tartu at telephone number 66-349, lives in the countryside near Tallinn and, of course, is registered there as a candidate for deputy to the Republic's Supreme Soviet...

All this has not gone unnoticed. For example, as they approved the new post of minister of economics, they asked Edgar Savisaar who would pay him the R15,000 if he wishes to return from the countryside after the elections. (Estonia has a bias against migration). Savisaar did not give an intelligible answer. As a result he lost support in the Supreme Soviet: He was refused the post of minister that he had been seeking. The NFE, by the way, just about declared the rejected Savisaar a national hero who had suffered for the common cause.

By the way, the whole NFE, not just the activists, was doing somersaults. It suddenly became a fierce advocate of the Citizens Committees of Estonia with whom it had not been friendly, to put it mildly, for all these years. And how could they be friends if the Citizens Committees believe that the Republic's Government and the Supreme Soviet itself, in which there are so many members of the NFE, are illegal? But it was worth it in order for the committees to become stronger and for Savisaar to leave the government, as an alternative NFE center had just proposed cooperation and direct aid to its former opponent.

Other reserves were put into action as well. Enn Pyldros, a former member of the CPSU and former member of the bureau of the CPE [Communist Party of Estonia] Central Committee, put himself at the head of the Liberal Party, and Maryu Lauristin became an organizer for the Social Democratic Party for an Independent Estonia. The aforementioned Tiyt Made created a party of entrepreneurs [PPE] for himself. It is written in the charter of the PPE that people who have compromised themselves in the years of Soviet power may not join the party. If that is so, then there can be no place in it for the leader of the entrepreneurs himself. His anti-Russian speeches are familiar to the entire country and have been sharply condemned by the USSR people's deputies from Estonia, and the academician M. Bronshteyn has publicly compared Made's actions to a knife in the back. Can one really say that a knifing does not compromise politics?

There are somersaults by the dozens. Blows have rained on the government thick and fast. The Tartu newspaper EDASI has run a caricature featuring Indrek Toome, chairman of the Council of Ministers, as a sort of boxer's punching bag. All the political organizations in Estonia, 21 of them, have been lashing out at him. Even the Social Democrats, driven on by Maryu Lauristin, have taken a place in line for the beating.

We will soon see how the voters evaluate these circus acrobatics. There is little time left before the elections to the ESSR Supreme Soviet: They take place on 18 March.

Latvian Candidate Discusses Political Issues

WA1903193390 Riga SOVETSKAYA LATVIYA in Russian 1 Mar 90 p 1

[Article by V. Smetannikov under the rubric "Introducing the Candidates": "I Want to Bring People Together"]

[Text] Instead of a speech, here is a report received by us, as the saying goes, from reliable sources:

"On 12 February of this year, the newspaper ATMODA, and later several other republic mass media sources, published a statement of the Duma of the Latvian People's Front concerning cases of anti- Semitism in individual cities of the country. It indicates that apparently 'there is no reason to believe that the law enforcement organs of the USSR are employing measures for the real protection of the life and honor of residents of Jewish nationality.'

"In this connection, it is necessary to state that in recent years and at the present time, our republic has not recorded manifestations associated with violent actions with respect to persons of Jewish nationality on the grounds of anti-Semitism. Attempts to direct public attention to a problem that does not exist in Latvia gives the assertions of the Duma of the Latvian People's Front a provocative character. The very fact that there is such a publication can, on the one hand, incite individuals who are anti- Semitically inclined to action, and, on the other hand, can intensify the emigration mood and the departure of persons of Jewish nationality from the USSR.

"The Committee for State Security of the Latvian SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] ensures the safety of all citizens within the scope of its jurisdiction, regardless of their national or racial affiliation, and also religious convictions. The organs of the KGB, jointly with the MVD [Ministry of Internal Affairs] and the Procuracy of the republic, will always warn about and suppress unconstitutional actions by individual persons or organizations aimed at instigating national and racial inequality."

This statement was transmitted to us from the Latvian SSR KGB Department for the Protection of the Soviet Constitutional System. The chief of this department, Krisjanis Ejhmanis, is a candidate for people's deputy of the republic and is registered in Riga election district No. 53.

"For a sovereign, rule-of-law, and economically developed and ecologically clean republic.

"For a truly scientific and thoroughly considered approach to questions of the development of a Latvian state as a means for the quickest possible increase in the well-being and standard of living of all of the people.

"For the harmonious development of society under the conditions of a multiparty system, and for political culture in relations between its individual elements and their peaceful coexistence. For an objective party publication and the independence of state mass media..."

This is only part of the pre-election platform of deputy candidate K. Ejhmanis, who was nominated by the work collective of the Third Joint Hospital, "Latbumprom" [Latvian paper industry], and other organizations of the capital of Latvia. Whether he will become a deputy or not will be decided by the voters, of which there are more than 9,000 in the 53d District.

Who is he, this candidate, and what is his background? The 48- year-old K. Ejhmanis last year was appointed chief of the Latvian SSR KGB Department for the

Protection of the Soviet Constitutional System. He was born in the Bauskiy Rayon. His mother worked as a bookkeeper, and his father worked on the railroad. K. Ejhmanis graduated from the Riga construction technical secondary school, and this determined a rather long period of his life. He worked on building projects in his home rayon, and he became a work superintendent. When he served in the Army, he had occasion to take part in the erection of important installations on the territory of Central Asia.

What does the deputy candidate's current work consist of? On 31 January of this year, our newspaper recounted in considerable detail the functions of the Committee for State Security department that he heads. We will recall that the new subdivision took the place of the "fifth," which had existed since 1967 to fight against ideological subversive activity.

"Changes of this kind in the structure of the KGB," Krisjanis Krisjanovic said during my interview with him then, "are fundamental in nature. They became important steps in the radical perestroyka in the Committee for State Security system, which proceeded logically from the important changes in the domestic and foreign policy of the Soviet state... Of course, the protection of the constitutional system is, in the final analysis, a state task. Soviet and public organizations, and their managers, must be involved in it, and, in a broad sense of the word, all true patriots of our country. And the subdivision established in the KGB structure will fulfill only the specific functions within the scope of its official jurisdiction."

But we will return to K. Ejhmanis's pre-election program. What does he support when he adheres to (in his words) social justice and the unity of words and deeds?

One of the main points of the candidate's platform is devoted to the supremacy of law and the development and adoption of truly democratic normative acts that are subordinate to the interests of all of the people. Including those that are aimed at strengthening law and order and the fight against crime. Moreover, on the condition of careful control over their observance.

K. Ejhmanis is convinced that the economic independence of Latvia, within the framework of a Soviet Federation, must be based on the foundation of agreed and mutually beneficial cooperation both with union republics and with foreign countries. He is for the priority of the development of agriculture, for the introduction of waste-free and ecologically clean technologies in industry, and for the capable use and combination of various forms of property. And also for public and deputy control over the distribution of material wealth, and for making better provisions for the indigent groups of the population, taking rates of inflation into account...

Such are the basic theses of the program of K. Ejhmanis, candidate for people's deputy of the Latvian SSR. We have not by any means presented it in its entirety, but one can judge with confidence, even from the excerpts, that his pre-election platform has a good constructive basis. It, this program, is not built on "heightened" emotions, but is dictated by reason, and by the real situation in our republic. Apparently, K. Ejhmanis's professional qualities had an effect here: Chekists like accuracy—this is an immutable rule of the current generation of state security officials.

But nothing human is alien to them, otherwise Krisjanis Krisjanovic would not have written this phrase in his program: "I want people who speak in different languages to get together. So that they will understand each other. Without this, living conditions cannot be improved."

Mutual understanding is the key to the resolution of many topical situations (fortunately or unfortunately, time will tell, because, as Shakespeare said, time is the best judge) which are so plentiful in our life today.

The Sunday issue of SOVETSKAYA LATVIYA published an open letter from employees of the Directorate of the USSR KGB for Rostov Oblast, which states in part:

"Recently, publications have been appearing in the mass media that directly or indirectly defame the Armed Forces and the activity of the organs of internal affairs and state security, which in any state are the guarantors of stability and integrity."

"I can relate this assertion, unfortunately, to our republic as well. Unfounded denigration has never brought any good," said K. Ejhmanis. "I hope that my potential electors and residents of Latvia in general who will take part in the elections will agree with me. I will not begin to defend our committee: It is not entirely ethical for me, as one of its employees, to do this. But I will talk about the Army. A lot of critical arrows are flying in the direction of the Army today. There is no doubt that there is deserved criticism. But quite a lot is far-fetched and unfounded. There are young people who believe the insinuations and refuse to be drafted, and as a result the procuracy has to get involved with them.

"Yes, there were mistakes in the past, and they have already been admitted and publicized. Not everything is right today either: for example, the low social protection of servicemen. But, honestly, it is not right for any momentary pretext, especially a clearly false one, to cast a shadow on the entire history of the Army, on all of those who wear the uniform. The people preserve in their memories the deeds of the Latvian Red Riflemen on the front lines in the civil war. We never forget that Latvia was liberated from the Nazi invaders at the cost of so many soldiers' lives.

"Veterans of the war—and there are less and less of them—deserve special attention. That is why I emphasize in my pre- election program that, while being opposed to all kinds of privileges, I believe: They have to be maintained for invalids. In my opinion, the soldier-Afgantsy [Afghanistan veterans], who went through the

test of fire during what appeared to be quite peaceful years for our country, need respect and continuous concern. Soviet Army and Navy Day is dear to fathers and mothers whose sons serve today in the ranks of the Soviet Armed Forces. And using this occasion, I want, from the bottom of my heart, to wish these young men success in their difficult service (When and where was the lot of a soldier ever easy?) And for their parents, I wish the quickest possible meeting with their children who have approached manhood and gotten stronger in their paternal home.

...How to know the wishes and living conditions of the voters in as much detail as possible and to maintain with them not an official but an especially trustful and continuous communication—this is the sincere aspiration of K. Ejhmanis, which he wants to fulfill if he is elected deputy to the Latvian parliament.

Latvian People's Front Official on Independence

LD1903223490 Stockholm Domestic Service in Swedish 1545 GMT 19 Mar 90

[Report by correspondent Anders Eriksson in Riga]

[Text] So to the Baltic nations. As far as can be judged, Latvia and Estonia will soon be following the Lithuanian example and declaring themselves independent states, reports our correspondent, who has met a leader of the Latvian People's Front.

True, the Latvian People's Front has not yet got the two-thirds majority it needs—it still lacks one or two mandates—but these are expected to be gained in the second round, to be held in two weeks. When the majority is assured, the Latvians will follow the Lithuanian example and declare Latvia an independent state, says Ivars Godmanis, vice chairman of the People's Front.

[Begin Godmanis recording in English followed by Swedish translation] I am very sure that if we achieve two-thirds we will do the same as Lithuania, and nothing less, because we are very sure that Moscow understands only clearcut politics. [end recording]

I believe it is futile to negotiate first; it is best to make a declaration of independence right from the start, says Godmanis, who is tipped by observers here to be the People's Front candidate for the post of president of Latvia. Godmanis also says that the Lithuanians need not take up the battle with Moscow alone: So far we have coordinated our decisions in the Baltic republics, and will continue to do so, says Godmanis.

In Estonia, too, the election has been a success for the forces striving for independence. With two-thirds of the seats allotted, everything points to Estonia's Supreme Soviet also getting a sufficient majority to adopt a declaration of independence. Therefore most indications are that the USSR President Mikhail Gorbachev will have to deal not with one republic declaring independence, but three in a few weeks time.

Preliminary Results for Latvian Elections Reviewed

LD1903112390 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0948 GMT 19 Mar 90

[By TASS correspondent Galina Kuching]

[Text] Riga, 19 March—Elections to the republic's parliament were held in Latvia on Sunday. The results are awaited in tense anticipation, for the future status of Latvia will depend on who wins the 201 seats. The People's Front, which aims to restore independent statehood, has endeavored to obtain two thirds of the seats so that it will have the opportunity to change the articles of the Constitution without hindrance.

According to intial reports received at the Latvian Communist Party's campaign headquarters, 170 seats have been decided. Repeat election are to be held in 29 constituencies. One constituency has yet to report, and in another candidates are still being nominated.

CPSU members have won 97 seats in the new parliament; 34 of them are at the same time supporters of the People's Front. A total of 108 seats have gone to candidates who support the Front's program.

Among the most popular candidates were Prime Minister Vilnis Bresis, who received 95.3 percent of the votes, and—slightly behind him—Chairman of the Presidium of the Latvian Supreme Soviet Anatoliy Gorbunov, with a total of about 86 percent. None of the five Central Committee secretaries of the Latvian Communist Party ran for election. Party committee secretaries in rural areas failed for the most part to beat the candidates backed by the People's Front. The picture is different in the republic's capital, where party leaders at the rayon and city levels came out on top. The election results for this public organization were affected by a split in the ranks of the communists, some of whom are engaged in creating an independent party.

Seats were won by, among others, the leaders of the People's Front, the Interfront, the Social Democrats, the Green Party, and the Movement for Latvian National Independence. Orthodox priest Aleksey Zotov gained a place in the parliament, whereas the Archbishop of the Lutheran-Evangelic Church Karlis Gaylitis lost out in his constituency to USSR People's Deputy Yuriy Boyars.

There are only nine women and one peasant among those elected to the Supreme Soviet. Few of them are workers.

Compared to the local soviet elections last December, the voter turnout was undoubtedly higher, especially in rural areas. This is due to the very intense competition between the rival forces, and also to the influence of events in neighboring Lithuania.

The Central Election Commission expects to release the official voting results this evening.

Participation in Election Viewed

LD1903235990 Riga Domestic Service in Latvian 1830 GMT 19 Mar 90

[Text] The official results of the elections to the Latvian Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR] Supreme Soviet held yesterday will be announced on 22 March. However, already this morning the Central Elections Commission was able to give information about their principal result: The new parliament of Latvia has been elected. Talking about the provisional results of the elections, Gunars Blums, chairman of the Central Elections Commission, noted that on 18 March the republic's inhabitants showed an enviable activity, 80 percent of all the electorate participated in the formation of the new legislative organ of Latvia. Unfortunately, the people of Riga showed the least interest. However, at least 170 candidate Latvian SSR people's deputies have gained the official status of deputy. The fate of 31 mandates will be ascertained in the near future. On 1 April repeat ballots will be held in 14 constituencies and repeat elections in 17 constituencies. A reply to the question of which parties and other public/potential organizations of Latvia have obtained the majority of seats in the new parliament will be given later. It can, however, be concluded that an obvious predominance has been gained by the People's Front of Latvia. Less than 10 percent of the members of the new Latvian SSR Supreme Soviet are deputies of the previous convocation. Only five percent of the mandates have been obtained by young people, but women are represented least of all.

More on Latvian Elections

LD2003000590 Vilnius in English to Europe 2230 GMT 19 Mar 90 (tentative)

[Radio Vilnius correspondent Martins Gravitis report from Riga on local election results]

[Summary] Of those 170 elected, 120 were candidates supported by the People's Front. A number of the present statesmen have been elected as well, among them Anatoliy Gorbunov, chairman of the Supreme Soviet. He got 85 percent of the vote in his constituency, which is the highest percent of votes. In 17 constituencies new candidates are to be nominated and in 14, repeat elections will take place. In order to get two-thirds of the parliamentary seats the People's Front still needs to win elections in 10 constituencies at least.

Second Round Viewed

LD2003132390 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1057 GMT 20 Mar 90

[Text] Riga, 20 March [TASS]—TASS correspondent Galina Kuchina reports: "The new Latvian parliament will be the arena of a war of nerves"—that is how Dainis Ivans, chairman of the Latvian People's Front [LPF], commented on the distribution of political forces following Sunday's elections to the Supreme Soviet of this Baltic republic.

As has already been reported, according to preliminary figures, the members of this public organization gained 108 seats out of 201. Although the LPF did not manage to gain the desired two-thirds of the seats in parliament the first time, its leaders still hope for success in the second round.

Nor are the LPF's rivals satisfied with the results of the vote. Igor Lopatin, chairman of the Interfront Council, reckons that the candidates backed by his organization won 43 mandates. "We are striving to see that none of the sides has a two-thirds majority in the parliament," he said. "After all, we have no mechanism to protect the interests of the minority. For that reason, the campaign for the 31 seats still vacant will be a fierce one."

In the opinion of Anton Bril, secretary of the Latvian Communist Party Central committee, "the election results reflect the real distribution of political forces." The communists who are in the People's Front and in the Interfront are taking up positions at opposite poles, he said. Anton Bril expressed the hope that the drafts for the new party rules and party program now being prepared for publication, which were worked out in the course of preparation for the 25th congress of the Latvian Communist Party, "will unite the members of the party and make them think the same way."

The repubican central election commission has embarked on summing up the figures. Its report is that 80.4 percent of the electorate participated in the elections, demonstrating the high level of activity of residents of Latvia. According to updated figures, the holders of 170 seats have been determined, 99 of which went to members of the Communist Party.

RSFSR

Reportage on RSFSR Run-off Elections

Voter Turnout 'Somewhat Lower'

LD1803123790 Moscow TASS in English 1228 GMT 18 Mar 90

[Text] Moscow March 18 TASS—By TASS correspondent Lev Askyonov:

Run-off elections of people's deputies are being held today in 65 regions of the Russian Federation, the largest union republic of the USSR. The voters are to elect more than 900 deputies.

The results of March 4 elections have shown that only 120 out of 1,068 people's deputies of Russia were elected. Since there was a large number of candidates per seat in an overwhelming majority of electoral districts,

the first round of polling did not produce in many cases the final results: none of candidates polled more than 50 per cent of the vote.

"According to data reaching us, a voter turn-out today is somewhat lower than two weeks ago," Anatoliy Petrov, secretary of the Russian Federation's Central Electoral Commission, told TASS.

"In the areas of the Far East and Siberia, approximately 6-7 per cent less voters took part in the polling by noon than on March 4. A low turn-out was also observed in Western Siberia—26-27 per cent."

There is a busy atmosphere at the Electoral Commission. Within 10-15 minutes that the TASS correspondent spent in the office of the commission's secretary, there were approximately 10 telephone calls—from Moscow, Daghestan, Siberia, and the Russian North. The secretary gave pieces of advice concerning contentious issues, explained complex aspects of electoral legislation and received information from district commissions.

On Saturday run-off elections took place in 104 districts. In one of districts in Tatar Autonomous Republic, only 45.5 per cent of voters turned out and the elections there were recognised as invalid.

The Central Electoral Commission does not yet have accurate data as to who won Saturday elections in all districts. But some data are already available.

Vladislav Shamshin, chairman of the Council of Ministers of the Yakut Autonomous Republic, and Vladimir Bokov, chairman of the Novosibirsk Regional Executive Committee, were elected people's deputies of Russia. Lev Bashmakov, chairman of the Ryazan Regional Executive Committee, lost the election.

The polling is going on and the names of new people's deputies of the Russian Federation will become known in the coming days.

Preliminary Information

LD1903142990 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1430 GMT 18 Mar 90

[Excerpt] There is some preliminary information about the voting results. In the Yakutsk Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic, Shamshin, chairman of the Council of Ministers of the autonomous republic, has been elected as Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic [RSFSR] people's deputy. In the Kalmyk Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic, Babichev, deputy chairman of the CPSU Central Committee Department has been elected. In Novosibirsk Oblast, Mukha, first secretary of the Oblast Party Committee, and (Babkov), chairman of the Oblast Executive Committee, have been elected as RSFSR people's deputies. [passage omitted on Ukraine election results]

Further Preliminary Results

LD1903144190 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0900 GMT 19 Mar 90

[Excerpt] The editors have begun to receive preliminary results of the repeat ballots to elect deputies in the Russian Federation, Ukraine, and Belorussia, which were held over the weekend. Mayak has already reported the first such figures received by the Moscow City Electoral Commission. Now we have news from other areas.

In Udmuritya, 13 people have won Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic people's deputies' mandates as the result of a repeat ballot. There is not a single important person from the party or local soviet leadership of the autonomous republic among them. The body of deputies to the Udmurt Supreme Soviet is also almost complete. One hundred and seventy-five deputies represent the most varied social strata. Repeat elections will have to be held in 25 constituencies.

More than 70 percent of the electorate took part in repeat ballots in Bashkiriya. Thus far, 25 people out of the 27 RSFSR people's deputies for the autonomous republic have gained mandates. Only two of them are workers, the remainder representing the administrative apparatus. To date, 267 people's deputies have been elected in Bashkiriya. Repeat elections are to be held in 13 constituencies. [passage omitted on Belorussian, Ukrainian elections]

Vote-Counting Continues

LD1903224490 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1530 GMT 19 Mar 90

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] Good day, comrades. As you know, elections for deputies to the republican and local soviets were held yesterday in the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic, Ukraine, and Belorussia. Counting the votes has continued all day today, and to date the following details have been reported by telephone from the Central Electoral Commission for elections in the Russian Federation. Repeat ballots were to be held in 913 constituencies. They were held everywhere except in four constituencies, where fewer than 50 percent of the voters turned out to vote. The turnout ranged from 57 percent in Leningrad and Moscow Oblast to more than 80 percent in Buryatiya, or Belgorod Oblast. Deputies were elected in 910 constituencies, and it will be possible to hold a congress of RSFSR people's deputies.

24 Deputies Elected in Minsk

LD2003074690 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1600 GMT 19 Mar 90

[Text] Preliminary results of the repeat elections have been summed up in Minsk. In the second round, 24 people's deputies of the republic were elected in the city.

Mikhasev, chairman of Minsk town executive committee, and Misuno, first secretary of the city party committee, [title as heard] failed to get the necessary number of votes. The protocols coming in from constituency electoral commissions are still being processed, although it is already clear that the elections for people's deputies in the republic are not completely over.

Reformers Win in Moscow, Leningrad

AU1903220990 Paris AFP in English 2053 GMT 19 Mar 90

[Excerpt] Moscow, March 19 (AFP)—Reformers gained control of the municipal councils in Moscow and Leningrad, the two largest cities in the Soviet Union, in local elections which ended on Sunday, according to results released Monday. The Radio Moscow publication INTERFAX said that members of the reformist alliance Democratic Russia had gained 56 per cent of the seats on Moscow's municipal council.

Quoting a member of the electoral commission in the Soviet capital, it said that 57 per cent of eligible voters took part in the second round of voting in Moscow on Sunday. The first round of voting took place on March 4.

A total of 498 seats were up for grabs on the Moscow city council on Sunday. INTERFAX said that Democratic Russia won 281 of the 463 seats decided. In voting for a parliament for the Russian Federation, Democratic Russia won 55 of the 65 seats reserved for the capital, INTERFAX said.

In Leningrad, a coalition called Democratic Elections-90 picked up nearly 60 per cent of the seats on the local city council, TASS news agency said. Democratic Elections-90, made up of 40 separate groups including the Popular Front of Leningrad, a Social-Democratic Association and a writers' union, ran on a platform of support for a multi-party system, decentralization of the economy and sovereignty for Russia. Leningrad Mayor Vladimir Khodyrev was reelected but apparently has little chance of remaining in the post following the reformist surge. [passage omitted]

Volgograd Bureau, Secretaries 'Forced To Resign'

LD1503122190 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1100 GMT 15 Mar 90

[Text] A party oblast report-back and election conference began in Volgograd today. This was preceded by stormy events. The negative evaluation was called forth by the command-and-administrative methods of the oblast's former leadership and by violations of the principles of social justice. The Bureau of the party's oblast committee and its secretaries were forced to resign.

A temporary oblast committee bureau has been elected to do the groundwork for and hold the conference. It is being conducted in two stages. At the first session the report-back speeches of the party's oblast committee are being discussed. The delegates will have to elect a new oblast committee staff and first secretary, a post for which some 30 people have been nominated. Then the conference will interrupt its work and will continue it after the report-back and election campaign in the party organizations. Usmanov, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, is participating in the work of the conference.

Western Republics

Belorussian Run-off Election Results Reported

LD1903144990 Moscow TASS in English 1432 GMT 19 Mar 90

[Text] Minsk March 19 TASS—Belorussia held the second round of elections to the republican parliament on Sunday. In 190 constituencies two candidates who won the greatest number of votes in the first round continued their contest last Sunday.

However, 90 seats, a quarter of the republican parliament, remain vacant even after the run-off elections.

The new republican election law says that a candidate wins if he collects over 50 per cent of the ballot. Only 24 deputies were elected during the first round in Minsk while the voting was held in 42 constituencies.

As was the case in the first round, the main mass movements could increase their representation in the republican legislature.

Newly elected deputies include an environmentalist group led by Academician Yevgeniy Konoplya, vice-president of the Belorussian Ecological Union, as well as members of the Belorussian Language Society headed by an author, Professor Nil Gilevich.

The turnout was somewhat lower this time: only 77 per cent of voters went to the polls. The run-off elections were held in all constituencies. The remaining 90 seats will be contested later.

More on Belorussian Elections

WA2003135190 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0900 GMT 19 Mar 90

[Excerpt] [passage omitted on RSFSR election results] Our correspondent reports that in Brest, the required proportion of the town's residents turned out to vote in only one-fifth of the constituencies. Nominations of candidates have begun again in the remainder, and the elections have been postponed until April.

Ivashko, Rukh, Greens Win in Ukraine Elections

LD2003000990 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1600 GMT 19 Mar 90

[Text] During the second round of elections in the Ukraine there were a number of constituencies where the

results of voting undoubtedly influenced the future political balance of forces in the republic. Attention was focused upon the constituency in Kiev where the fight for the seat was waged by Ivashko, first secretary of the Communist Party of the Ukraine Central Committee, and (Kvas), instructor at the Polytechnical Institute. The Communist Party leader won.

The picture was different in other constituencies in the Ukrainian capital. Henceforth Kiev will be represented in the republican parliament by a large group of deputies sharing the positions of Rukh [Ukrainian Movement for Perestroyka] and the Green Movement. For the moment, one can only say that almost all of the more than 300 deputies' seats that remained vacant following the first round have at last been filled.

Ukraine Supreme Soviet Candidate Disqualified

LD1603124190 Kiev in Ukrainian to North America 2200 GMT 15 Mar 90

[Excerpts] Repeat elections to the Ukrainian SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] Supreme Soviet were held today in 10 constituencies of Nikolayev Oblast. In other oblasts of the republic, such elections will be held on 17 and 18 March. However, some of the candidates who reached the run-off round have been disqualified. One of these is Oleksiy Dmitriyev, manager of the 4th division of the major radio-relaying lines in the Crimea. It ensures the good reception of republican and local radio and television programs but cannot broadcast on its own.

Disregarding this rule, Dmitriyev invited a journalist and opened a channel for live broadcasts. In nine five-minute broadcasts she presented a sympathetic profile of Dmitriyev. This frivolity of the would-be-deputy not only runs counter the rules governing the utilization of communication channels, but also violates the election law. [passage omitted]

Dmitriyev has been disqualified and will be prosecuted.

Kharkov Soviet Accuses Party Leaders of Abuse

LD1603214890 Moscow World Service in Russian 1030 GMT 16 Mar 90

[Text] Unprecedented events in the Ukrainian town of Kharkov have become public knowledge. The oblast Soviet of People's Deputies has accused a number of local party leaders of abuse of their official position and sanctioned an investigation of them. As has become known, they built dachas for themselves using financial funds and building materials allocated for repairs of the town's housing stock.

The local party newspaper, which published these facts, expressed a lack of confidence in the oblast party committee.

Ukrainian Peasant-Democratic Party Founded

LD1603121590 Kiev in Ukrainian to North America 2200 GMT 15 Mar 90

[Text] Another session of the initiative group for creating the Ukrainian Peasant-Democratic Party has been held in Lvov. What goals will it pursue? Here is Petro Moroz, USSR people's deputy, chairman of a collective farm in Lvov Oblast. He is one of the party's founders:

[Begin recording] [Moroz] The party will strive to give social protection to those living and working in the countryside.

[Unidentified correspondent] What is the peasants' response to this idea? Favorable or hostile?

[Moroz] Quite favorable. Many peasants say that we must unite today, at a time when various parties, groups, and associations are emerging. And what are peasants? Just observers standing on the sideline? After our program was published, many people phoned and wrote to me saying that this is the only way to protect and assert ourselves in today's political life. [end recording]

Central Asia

Instigators of Tajik 'Coup' Removed, Expelled

LD1903193990 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1600 GMT 19 Mar 90

[Report by unidentified TASS correspondent]

[Text] The Supreme Soviet Presidium of the Tajik Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR] has relieved Karimov, deputy chairman of the Tajik SSR Council of Ministers and chairman of the republican State Planning Committee, and Tabarov, minister of culture, of the posts they occupied because they compromised themselves during the well-known February events that took place in the Tajik capital. A decree to this effect has been published in the local press and broadcast on republican television.

Not long before, the communists of the republic gave a political evaluation of the two leaders. At a plenum of the Tajik Communist Party Central Committee both were expelled from the ranks of the CPSU by a majority vote. Investigation will determine the degree of their culpability. As has already transpired, Karimov, Tabarov, and a number of other individuals who hold senior posts in the party and government apparatus of the republic, profiting by the instability of the social and political situation in Dushanbe, attempted, among other things, to remove the chairman of the republican Council of Ministers by unconstitutional means. To that end, a draft decree of the Tajik SSR Supreme Soviet Presidium was prepared and the text of an appeal to the republican population about handing over power to a provisional people's committee was drawn up. Fortunately, the attempts by certain political forces in the republic to carry out a palace coup failed. Currently, a group of investigators is operating in Dushanbe to find

participants in mass disorders and their immediate organizers. Charges of pogroms, arson, attempts on human life have been brought against more than 50 citizens.

A state of emergency and a curfew are still in effect in Dushanbe; the social and political situation, though, is changing for the better. All industrial enterprises and establishments and the public transportation system are working. As an exception, the republican Supreme Soviet Presidium has given permission for mass events on 21 March in Dushanbe, linked to Navruz, the traditional Oriental celebrations of the spring equinox.

However, not all news is cheerful. Warnings of attempts by certain individuals to provoke young people to hold new unsanctioned rallies and to collect signatures in defense of Karimov, former leader of the Provisional People's Committee, are coming to the republican law-protecting bodies. There are warnings of attempts to bring pressure to bear upon members of the republican commission for the investigation of the events of 12-14 February set up by the Tajik SSR Supreme Soviet. All these facts are being thoroughly investigated by the republic's competent bodies.

Tajik Deputies Interviewed on Dushanbe Situation

LD1603230590 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1530 GMT 16 Mar 90

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] [Announcer] On the situation in Dushanbe, our correspondent talks to USSR people's deputies from Tajikistan. [video shows unidentified correspondent interviewing group of people in a foyer. He begins by addressing K. Makhkamov, first secretary of the Tajik Communist Party Central Committee]

[Correspondent] Makhkam Makhamovich, do you believe that the situation in Tajikistan has already become sufficiently stable at present?

[Makhkamov] Yes, I can now confirm that the situation in the republic is stable—especially in Dushanbe—and it is controllable [upravlyayemaya]. Of course, those two or three days that shook the whole country are now already behind us. But we will have to tackle in the very near future many problems that have arisen in this connection.

[L. Sherali] Undoubtedly those events received objective coverage. But there were articles that, I would say, exacerbated the situation by laying emphasis only on nationality or on alleged anti-Russian sentiments causing those events. In actuality nothing of the sort happened. Take for example, Kruzhilin's article in LITERATURNAYA GAZETA citing cases that create the impression that only Russians suffered there. For example, among those wounded he lists mostly Russians. And it is alleged that there were only Russians among those raped and allegedly only Russians as well among those injured and killed. However, none of this is true. According to the official figures, 24 people [corrects himself] 23 people died. Seventeen of them were from among the local population. As to rape cases, not a single such case has been registered.

[V. Giro, aircraft captain] The claim that only the Russian-speaking population was affected during those events is not quite just. But generally speaking, it was the Tajik population that brought it all about, as it were. This must not be concealed. There is something else that I would like to add to this. You know especially in the east of the country certain developments have now emerged, as a result of which Tajikistan is being boycotted in some respects. And it is precisely the press and television that have begun to issue reports that Russians are being attacked there, as the saying goes. Therefore, the supplies of timber and other materials are not coming through. I wish to appeal to all comrades. All this is only getting in the way of the normal existence of the Russian-speaking population in Tajikistan, simply creating a more strained situation. This should not be done by any means. You are all our brothers, and we are your brothers. And in this situation, on the contrary, you must assist our region as much as possible.